

From
PHARAOH TO HITLER



מתי קץ חפלאות?

Chicago Jewish Chronicle

WHEN WILL COME THE MIRACULOUS END?

From
PHARAOH TO HITLER
“What is a Jew?”

BERNARD J. BROWN
AUTHOR, LECTURER
MEMBER OF THE CHICAGO BAR

CONSOLIDATED BOOK PUBLISHERS, INC.
CHICAGO

*This first edition of From
Pharaoh to Hitler, printed
April, 1933, consists of
two thousand copies*

COPYRIGHT, 1933, BY BERNARD J. BROWN
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE
BRITISH EMPIRE
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
FOREWORD	XI
I. THE JEWISH QUESTION	1
II. THE WONDERING JEW	14
III. VOX POPULI	26
IV. ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?	51
V. THE RACE MYTH	73
VI. UPSTREAM	101
VII. OLD CLOTHES	111
VIII. THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX	132
IX. MISTAKES OF ISRAEL	167
X. THE ANSWER	185
INDEX	215

■

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

WHEN WILL COME THE MIRACULOUS END? . *Frontispiece*

BLOWING OF THE SHOFAR *Between pages 64–65*

MODERN BLOWING OF THE SHOFAR . *Between pages 64–65*

THE RABBI *Facing page 116*

LOUIS D. BRANDEIS *Facing page 213*

■

FOREWORD

IN THE course of my practice I found myself in a case where it became necessary to prove in a court of law that a certain person was a Roman Catholic on the day he applied for admission in the Catholic Order of Foresters.

The uniqueness of the issue and the simplicity of proof required, suggested the thought: what proof would avail had the issue involved a Jew. How would one proceed to prove, for example, that I was a Jew if I had applied for admission to a Jewish Order restricted to Jews only? This inquiry slowly assumed tremendous proportions and seemed to embrace the entire structure known as Jewry. The search for the truth led me down the devious roads traveled by the Jewish people, along the lands marked with facts and legends of the past, to the crossroads that perplex us today, and made me wonder which path will be taken and where it will lead tomorrow.

From the investigation I have made of available sources and from discussions of the subject with Rabbis, Laymen, Journalists, Zionists and non-Zionists, I have come to the conclusion that neither Jew nor Gentile can intelligently answer the question "What is a Jew?" Certainly not as intelligently as either could answer the question what is a German, or what is a Catholic, or what is a Nordic. I have become impressed with the conviction that the Jewish question will not be solved as long as we remain ignorant of the meaning of the term Jew as applied to those of the present age who are generally designated as Jews.

In the arrangement of the material bearing on the subject of Jews and Judaism I have followed the course

FOREWORD

of a lawyer seeking to establish the claim of his client to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and my hope is that the reader will follow the case made as a Juror without passion and prejudice; unhindered by preconceived notions on the subject. In the words of Jean Jacques Rousseau: "Expect from me neither learned declaration nor profound argument. I am no great philosopher and give myself but little trouble in regard to becoming such. Still I perceive sometimes the glimmer of good sense and have always a regard for the truth. I will lay down my own sentiments in simplicity of heart, consult your own during this recital; this is all I require of you. If I am mistaken it is undesignedly and if I am right, reason, which is common to us both, shall decide."

BERNARD J. BROWN.

■

From
PHARAOH TO HITLER

■

CHAPTER I

THE JEWISH QUESTION

*Into this Universe, and why not knowing,
Nor whence, like water willy-nilly flowing;
And out of it, as wind along the waste,
I know not whither, willy-nilly blowing.*

OMAR KHAYYAM.

HUMANITY, groping through superstition and ignorance, has solved many problems affecting human rights and privileges. It has abolished slavery, dethroned kings, and evolved forms of government that rest upon the consent of the governed. It has separated church from state and firmly established freedom of worship almost everywhere. The Jewish problem, however, although it has agitated the minds and hearts of men from time immemorial, still remains misunderstood, unsolved and unanswered. That there is such a problem everywhere cannot be gainsaid; that it is real and vital, no one can deny. Whether non-Jews are aware of it is not so important as is the fact that in every land all Jews are conscious of its presence.

While we must concede that, as far as it was in the power of any nation so to do, the Jews, officially and legally, have been granted equality before the law in almost every country on earth and they have thus become citizens of the land of their abode, our sensitive ears can still detect the rumbling of anti-Semitism everywhere. We note that in Germany almost half of the voting population cast its fortunes in the general election of 1932 with a party whose main political tenet is the extermina-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

tion of the Jew in the land that gave birth to Moses Mendelssohn, Giacomo Meyerbeer and Heinrich Heine; in Holland and Switzerland, always regarded as the refuge for persecuted and oppressed, we discern anti-Semitism on many fronts; in Roumania, Cuza and Jarga are at the head of a national organization whose sole purpose is the suppression of the Jews. While Soviet Russia is sincerely trying to stamp out anti-Semitism, to the Jews it becomes more prominent because of the effort to destroy it. In Poland pogroms are still being perpetrated upon the Jews by the so-called intelligentsia of the nation. Even in Palestine the graves of Jewish victims of brutal violence are still fresh and the combined Moslem forces have declared themselves unalterably opposed to any further immigration of Jews into the Holy Land. In Canada, we are surprised to hear the mayor of one of the greatest cities in the entire dominion consigning the Jews to Hell in a public speech; and in America, the land of the free and home of the brave, we complain that no Jews are admitted, and those already here appear to be subjected to such subtle discriminations socially, educationally, and politically, as would be deemed inconceivable under the philosophy of the Constitution.

These conditions may or may not be of a general and permanent nature, but for the Jews they are symptomatic of dangerous consequences. The modern thoughtful man wonders at the paradox of apparent oppression and persecution of Jews on the one hand and, on the other hand, the promotion and elevation of Jews to the highest places of honor, trust, and confidence in nearly every civilized nation. There is England with its Disraeli as prime Minister, and Lord Reading as Viceroy of India; there is Germany with Lasker and Ratenau; America with Bran-

THE JEWISH QUESTION

deis and Cardozo as Justices of the United States Supreme Court; Spain with Fernando de los Rios as minister of education; Canada with Factor and Jacobs as members of Parliament, and thousands of other men and women in nearly every land, generally known as Jews, wearing the mark of distinction conferred upon them by their fellow men. But in spite of it, from every nook and corner of the earth there rises the wail of Jewry: "When will come the miraculous end?" Within this query lies buried the age-old Jewish question involved in a maze of uncertainties never known before and for that reason more perplexing. Mr. Charles H. Joseph, an American journalist, recently circulated through the Jewish press in America the statement that sooner or later official Jewry will have to meet the issue, "What is a Jew?" Never, he says, have we known such a maze of seeming contradictions and anomalies concerning any people as those in which the Jews are involved. Since we are not sure about ourselves, how can we expect to explain ourselves intelligently to the world? "I have invited," he concludes, "time and again the outstanding minds in Jewry to define a Jew, but to date have received no light on the subject."

Fifty years ago if any one had asked, "What is a Jew?" he would have been laughed at as much as if he had asked, "What is an Apple?" Even today, intelligent Jews become bewildered when confronted with the inquiry. But honest and straight thinking, provoked by the question propounded by Mr. Joseph, leaves them cold and nonplused, and they begin to inquire of their rabbis. Rabbi Solomon Goldman, addressing his congregation in Chicago, declared that he is in receipt of numerous letters from young men and women attending his services

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

asking what is a Jew and what is Jewish religion. "You might as well ask a chemist what is an atom, and where oxygen comes from," was the answer. In the light of the experience of Jewry during more than 3000 years, and in view of the present befuddled intellectual status of Jews on the subject of Judaism, the Jewish Question looms up as a most absorbing problem for Jewry everywhere.

Until a century ago in every land the Jews were a well known and clearly defined element in human society, but they did not seem to fit in with the people among whom they lived and had their being. In Pharaoh's time the people of the children of Israel had become too many and too mighty, and there was fear that in case there befalleth the Egyptians a war, the Jews would join themselves to their enemies and fight against them; so it was thought best to get them out of the land. (Exodus 1-8.) After the liberation of the Jews from Egyptian bondage, and after the destruction of the Jewish national existence and the dispersion of the people, the Jewish problem remained the same.

In the days of Ahasuerus, "who reigned from India unto Ethiopia," Jews again became numerous and mighty, and Mordecai refused to bow before Haman. As a reason for the destruction of the Jews throughout the kingdom, Haman told the king that "there is a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of thy kingdom and their laws are diverse from those of every people; neither keep they the kings laws; therefore it profiteth not the king to suffer them." (Esther 3.) During all of the ages of Jewish existence there were Hamans everywhere, and at all times the charges were the same: the Jews live according to their own laws, neither do they keep the laws of the land.

THE JEWISH QUESTION

In our own time, comparatively speaking, the opponents of the Jewish Disability Bill in the English parliament argued that the Jews looked forward to the coming of a great deliverer, to their return to Palestine, to the rebuilding of their temple, to the revival of their ancient worship, and therefore, they will always consider England not as their country, but merely as their place of exile. The specific thing, therefore, in Jewry, which had always provoked opposition was their persistence in living according to their own laws, in maintaining a separate and exclusive existence, avoiding intercourse with non-Jews, and their eagerness to build insurmountable barriers which would make that intercourse more and more difficult if not impossible.

Whenever the opposition to Israel became unbearable in any nation, salvation was sought in escape to some other land, even as a youngster seeks to run away from home because the conditions under which he is required to live do not meet with his notions. It has always been the outward appearance of the Jew and his mode of life which caused the Gentile to heap ridicule, insult, and injury upon Israel, an apparent stranger in his community; and to "spit upon their garments, laugh at their religion, heat their enemies, cool their friends," and now and then visit them with a pogrom or a massacre. All this the Jew bore patiently and with humility, satisfied with an opportunity, grudgingly afforded him by the Gentiles, of securing a livelihood in whatever manner he could, wishing only to be permitted to worship his God in his own way.

The Jewish problem, as it confronted the non-Jews, ever was "What shall we do with our Jews?" The Jews thought the answer to this problem lay in his "*L'shonoh*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

H'ba B'Yerusholoyim" (in the year to come we shall be in Jerusalem). During the last century the Jewish problem while still with us has lost much of its definiteness. The average Jew has grown to manhood and no longer yearns to run away. He has learned that human progress depends on adjustment to environment; he has changed his hat, shaved his face, accepted all the obligations that modern society imposes upon the members of the community, and strives to avail himself of all the benefits civilization offers every man. He has even gone so far as to admit, in the words of Rabbi H. S. Enelow (an unpardonable sin a hundred years ago), that among the great and the good that the human race has produced, none has ever approached Jesus in universality of appeal and sway . . . "in him is combined what is best and most mysterious, and most enchanting in Israel."

Such change in attitude on the part of Jews would seem to be enough to bring about an harmonious condition between Jews and Gentiles, and yet, like Banquo's ghost, the Jewish Question is with us wherever we may happen to be. Unlike of old, it does not involve political equality or freedom of worship. No longer are the privileges of education denied to the Jew anywhere, even though the Jew can scent the presence of some sort of "subtle discrimination" in educational institutions everywhere. The Jew has abandoned the idea that Gentile language, Gentile books, and Gentile food is "*trafe pussel*" (unclean). The modern Jew, in the words of Dr. Kohler, has accepted Jesus as "the noblest and most lofty-minded of all teachers of Israel—as the very ideal of greatness and tenderness, yet still a man and a brother in heavenly luster shining like the sun—the helper of the poor, the friend of the sinner, the brother of every fellow-sufferer, the

THE JEWISH QUESTION

comfort of every sorrow-laden mortal." And yet in spite of it all, there is that question facing us everywhere and challenging an answer.

We do not live any longer according to the statutes and ordinances contained in the Torah. We have discarded our distinguishing outward appearance, have demolished our ghetto walls, and have walked into the midst of our Gentile fellow countrymen. In London, Paris, Berlin, New York, and Chicago, Jews are found living side by side with the Gentiles. In the trades and professions, in the counting house and laboratory, in the university and hospital, Jews and Gentiles are to be found working together—merely individuals in homogeneous industrial or social units, with everything in common. In Congress, Parliament, and Reichstag, Jews and Gentiles, representing the people of their countries, are harnessed together in an endeavor to legislate for the general good of all, unhampered by religious differences. In America, in England, in Germany, in France, and practically in every other country, Jews, by election or appointment, are occupying positions ranging from city aldermen to prime minister, serving their countries as citizens with no regard to any religious differences that may exist between them and other public officials. In every land, children of Christians and children of Jews sit side by side in public schools, being taught by the same teachers out of the same books, wearing the same clothes, speaking the same languages, singing the same songs, dancing to the same music, eating the same food and—licking each other's lollypops.

It is but human, under these conditions, that there should develop between Jew and non-Jew sincere friendships and great loves, often resulting in business asso-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

ciations and marital relations. But in spite of the reality of this amalgamation of tastes and mental attitudes of Jews and Christians, one can still hear the din of voices of rabbis and lay-Jews urging us to strengthen the Jewish nation, to perpetuate the unity of Jewry, to be conscious of the Jewish race, to maintain Jewish homes, to rear Jewish children and to preserve Jewish traditions. It is not surprising at all that there should arise in the minds of both Jews and Gentiles, living, loving, and working together, a desire to understand just what is meant by a Jewish nation; what particular characteristics identify a person as belonging to a Jewish race. What is a Jewish home? How are Jewish children reared and what are Jewish traditions which should be preserved? What are the real lines of demarcation between Jews and non-Jews, and if there are such lines of demarcation, shall they be strengthened or removed entirely? Most of us would like to know what will be the ultimate effect of the strengthening or weakening of these lines.

The tendency of the present generation is to refuse to allow its intellectual powers to be befuddled by sentimental clap-trap. It has arrived at the conclusion that "the past is a bucket of ashes," and that human welfare depends more upon concessions, adjustments, truth, and reason, than upon the preservation of ancient beliefs, old traditions, and racial distinctions. The youth of this generation have grasped the truth that the difficulties of the past were largely due to the inability of men to throw off beliefs and traditions that had been imposed upon mankind by the guardians of the Gods and the dispensers of His favors. In the words of Professor John Dewey, "Men of the present age realize that the business of thought is not to conform to or reproduce the characters

THE JEWISH QUESTION

already possessed by objects but to judge them as potentialities of what they become through an indicated operation." The question which should receive the attention of men and women of today is not what were the Jews of 2000 years ago, but what are they today, and what shall they become in the next generation. It may be that some Gentiles still wonder what to do with the Jews, but the Jews cannot meet the question by joining hands and singing "Ring Around A Rosie with Pockets Full of Posies." The *L'shonoh H'ba* of our fathers does not serve our present purpose.

With the economic and political emancipation of the Jews came comparative social equality and a realization of permanence and reasonable security; and the idea of being in Jerusalem in the years to come has lost much of its charm. The average Jew has an appreciation that root and branch he is securely embedded in the soil of his native land, and the thought of being pulled up and transplanted, even to Palestine, becomes repugnant; the idea of being led out of his country into the land that God had promised Abraham is no longer an idealistic dream but a nightmare.

Since, then, we no longer consider ourselves temporary sojourners anywhere, the problem confronts us in a new light. Just what is our status? What course are we to pursue if we are to preserve peace among ourselves, and live in harmony with our non-Jewish neighbors and fellow citizens? The answer to a social question affecting so many millions of people, cannot be approached without first establishing a base from which we can rationally examine every phase of it.

Every social phenomenon is enveloped in ancient traditions and customs, and these generally form the barbed-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

wire entanglements which meet every attempt to examine the phenomenon and consider its value. To solve the Jewish problem, which in its final analysis is a social problem, all traditions, all customs, and all accepted hypotheses must first be analyzed and the phenomenon itself examined with reference to the ascertainable facts. We must bring Israel a little closer, turn him over, submit him to the light of reason, test him by human experience and finally place him where in reality he belongs.

At the outset we must try to classify the Jews accurately and to understand the foundation upon which they can stand with all their rights, duties, and obligations clearly defined. We should separate, as far as it is possible so to do, those elements which enter into the term Jew, from those which are involved in the term Judaism, and consider each of these subjects in the light of present day knowledge and our own experience.

The popular idea of Jewishness depends upon the particular group of Jews involved. The Reform Jews, the Orthodox Jews, the Zionists, and non-Zionists, each present a different conception of the subject, yet all consider themselves Jews. The ideas on Judaism of these four groups alone show how confusing the seemingly obvious is, and how far one finds himself from a simple definition. The Orthodox Jew's understanding of the term Jew is any person who believes in the unity of God and the divinity of the Torah. According to this definition a Hindu, a Negro, or a Chinaman could become a Jew if he chose to accept the belief in God and the Torah. Conversely, one would cease to be a Jew if he abandoned the belief in God and the Torah. Under this definition Judaism makes one a Jew, but not so with the Reform Jew. He claims that Judaism is not a theology at all, but

THE JEWISH QUESTION

a "way of life." Consequently, a Jew is a Jew no matter to what extremes his belief in God—or entire lack of it—may carry him. The Reform Jew is not concerned whether his prayers be directed to God or to "the social force," so long as he considers himself a member of the group centered around his temple, or is in some way conscious of his Jewishness. Hence, a person born of Jewish parents may be a member of the Unitarian or Christian Science Church and still continue to live his Jewish life, retaining his membership in Jewish clubs and remaining on the directorate of Jewish charities, by which process Judaism becomes an effect rather than a cause. Judaism thus becomes the religion of those who call themselves Jews instead of Jews being the people who adhere to the Jewish religion.

The difference between these two groups may be said to be God and the Torah on the one hand, and the "way of life" on the other. It should also be remembered that the first group consists entirely of what is left of the Orthodox Jews, still believing in God and the Torah, while the second group is composed of men and women of the present generation who, with their descendants, in another generation, will be all that will be left of any kind of Jew.

The Zionists view the subject from a different angle. They maintain that the Jews are a nation regardless of all else, and the only solution of the Jewish Question lies in the re-establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. It is deemed, therefore, not inconsistent for many of the colonists in Palestine to entirely disavow a belief in God or the Torah. Of course, there are Jews there who continue to mourn at the Wailing Wall in the hope of restoring ancient Judaism, but these are not the

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

ones upon whom Jewish nationalism is founded. They are the last vestige of ancient Jewry, which is bound to disappear in spite of anything we may do to preserve it. The non-Zionists do not hesitate to pronounce the Jewish national idea a menace and a humbug. They contend that the Jewish people are a race and a race only, and must thus identify themselves no matter what becomes of Jewish religion.

Although the cursory glance we have given the definitions of what different groups of Jews mean by the term "Jew" would seem to indicate a vastly divergent conception of their status, yet they embrace all others in the unity of Jewry. The Jewish proclamation, "Hear, O Israel; the Lord is our God, the Lord is One," seems now to have been reversed in spirit, and to mean, "Hear, O Mankind, the Jews are God's people, the Jews are one."

All these contradictory opinions offer no choice to the thoughtful puzzled Jews from Moscow to Oshkosh, who feel themselves misfits in these classifications. This sense of bewilderment becomes more intense because there are almost no sign posts to indicate the true Gentile conception of Judaism, especially if we ignore the jaundiced expressions appearing here and there in the so-called anti-Semitic publications, and the false praise of those Christians who, for one reason or another, seek Jewish favor.

There are many Jews who claim that Judaism is a force or feeling in the breast of every Jew which cannot be eradicated. To illustrate their meaning they tell the story about a Jewish woman who had joined the Christian Science Church, and whose Jewish husband had presented her with a diamond studded crucifix. Upon finding that she had lost the jewel, she exclaimed, "Shemah Isruel! I have lost my crucifix!" Those Jews who accept the illus-

THE JEWISH QUESTION

tration as proof of Jewishness forget that for every such Jewish woman there are hundreds of thousands of Jews, members of synagogues and Jewish clubs, who often exclaim: "Jesus Christ! Why didn't you lead the ace?" Or, wondering about ways and means to raise funds for the temple, one would exclaim: "For Christ's sake, let's give a picnic and raise some money!" There is nothing within the breast of any Jew which can be classified as Jewishness: whatever there is of Judaism is in the mind of the Jew, and because he does not clearly understand the subject, he flounders about and grasps at every straw which would justify his attitude.

It is not intended by what follows to urge the revival of the Orthodox religion, or to suggest the acceptance of any other form of religion. Religious opinions of people are undergoing progressive changes as rapidly as freedom of thought replaces slave mentality; but what we shall seek to attempt is an inquiry into the question, "What is a Jew?" and the establishment of a basis from which we can intelligently determine if a solution of the Jewish question is possible, or at least to arrive at an understanding of what it involves.

CHAPTER II

THE WONDERING JEW

THE difficulties which confronted Jewry in the past did not involve social adjustment or political equality in any land. Our ancestors were not concerned with adjusting their religious convictions to social or industrial requirements. If the observance of the Sabbath interfered with their business, they were ready to suffer the consequences, whatever they were, but the Sabbath prevailed. The Torah and the Talmud were the only guides in their everyday life and determined their relations with their fellowmen. They found no quarrel with the Gentiles who maintained the union between Church and state, for they hoped that eventually they too would establish a state church in the land of their fathers and "Zion shall rule all the nations of the earth."

Israel was satisfied to remain a stranger until the time should come when he shall have been restored to his ancient glory. All that the Jew desired, while he waited and prayed, was to be let alone, and to preserve his Torah from the unclean hands of the goyim. Until the coming of his Messiah he was satisfied to be a wanderer.

*With my wanderer's staff in hand,
Thus I tramp from land to land,
Nowhere finding home and rest
For my wounded, weary breast,
Ever hearing all day long
Everywhere the same old song:
Round the earth, and to and fro,
Ever go! RASKIN Songs of a Wanderer*

THE WONDERING JEW

The conditions under which the Jews are now privileged to live in most countries leave no need for wandering; the Torah is safe in nearly every place on earth; the permanency of the abode is as firmly fixed for Israel as it is for anyone else, if Israel chooses to make it so. The present day Jew has succeeded in segregating himself from the hysteria and emotionalism which his leaders endeavor to impose upon him, and he is considering his problems in the light of reason and truth. He is conscious of the insignificance into which the things that were held sacred by his forefathers have fallen and is anxious to learn the reason or justification for their preservation.

The rabbi, refraining from speaking about a living God, is projecting the idea that the greatest force which preserves the unity of Jewry is a consciousness of being Jewish. But being consciously Jewish is like being consciously Nordic or Christian. It involves thinking about our own characteristics and leaves us no opportunity for anything else. It develops vanity and a snobbish conception of ourselves and our God and tends to place us apart from and above all the rest of mankind. There is no more virtue in being Jewishly conscious or consciously Jewish than there is in being consciously Democratic, or consciously Southern, or consciously Catholic or Protestant. There can be no peace or harmony between men of different consciousnesses.

The consciousness of a Ku Klux Klansman that he is a part of a group destined to determine the social life in the United States meets with our unqualified condemnation. The consciousness of a Nordic that he belongs to a group destined to govern mankind appears an abomination; the consciousness of a Teuton that his people filled the thrones of Europe clashes with the modern idea of

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

democracy. The consciousness of being Jewish stands in the same light. "Chauvinism," says Arthur Schnitzler, "of any kind whatsoever, I have always felt keenly, is unforgivably stupid. The Jew must always exert special care in avoiding it." Being consciously Jewish is the lowest kind of Chauvinism, for it is the only Chauvinism that is based on false premises. The most conspicuous things Jewish are our temples, and rabbis, and Bussor-Kosher meat markets, but these have as little meaning as have the crescent on a Mason or the antlers on the lapel of an Elk. Like the Wailing Wall, these are remnants of ancient Jewry. Tested by any rule of reason, submitted to even a superficial analysis, Judaism, like Christianity, has long since ceased to be an important element in human relations. Instead of wandering away from the land where his fathers died, the Jew of today wonders what there is that is still keeping him from free and unrestricted association with the rest of mankind. If it is not stupid Chauvinism, what else can it be and how can the disturbing element be eliminated? In our search for certainty today we ask questions intended to bring forth the truth; answers which befog the issue are no longer being accepted.

Chaim Trask of Kisheneff wants to know if his religion, with an anthropomorphic God and the strict observance of the Torah, is the same as the religion of Rabbi Louis Mann, with whom it is only "a way of life." He wants to know if his line of shoemaker ancestors, a smattering of cheder-learned-Hebrew, and the trail from apprentice to shoemaker, is the same background as is that of a Rufus Isaacs or a Disraeli. He wants to know if his historic consciousness involving the conscription of his ancestors into military service under Nicholas I, the

THE WONDERING JEW

glimmer of some freedom under Alexander II, the pogroms and massacres under Alexander III, and the persecution under Rasputin, is the same as that of Judge Louis Brandeis, the late Julius Rosenwald, or Sir Isaac Isaacs. This Chaim Trask and sixteen million other men and women want to know if there is any reality behind all this talk about Jewish history, Jewish background, and Jewish tradition.

When he hears about the proposed return to Palestine he puckers up his brow and tries to understand what really is intended to be accomplished. He knows that Jews in Russia have joined the Communists, Jews in America love America and have no intention to migrate to some other homeland. He knows that from time immemorial, from Abraham to this day, Jews, like other humans, have migrated from country to country in the belief that now here, and then there, they would establish a homestead, but, unlike others, they always hoped that at the end of their travels they would land in Palestine.

Now the Chaim Trasks everywhere want to know what this homeland which is proposed to be established in Palestine, not by force of arms or the will of God, but by charitable funds, is going to be and how its permanence will be secured. Keeping in mind the experience of mankind in establishing nations and securing liberty, he wants to know at the outset whether we propose to establish a Jewish nation with the Jewish religion as its foundation, and whether his religion or that of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise is going to be the state religion. He wants to know what Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver means by the declaration that a Jewish national homeland in Palestine, "must mean, and can only mean that Palestine should become sufficiently Jewish to be a center of the

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Jewish national life, cultural, religious, and political." What, asks the average Jew, shall the Jewish National Religion be, a belief in God and the divinity of the Torah, or a belief that Jews are descendants of Abraham, David, Saul, or Solomon?

He knows that the only way an independent nation can be established in Palestine is by forcing all outside authority from the land, and the men and women occupying it uniting in one social organization for the preservation of the liberty of every one of them. He knows that an independent nation can be established in Palestine only by terminating the British Mandate and all other extra-territorial control and influence. He wonders if the Jews intend to establish a Palestinian Nation of Palestinian people or a Jewish Nation of Jews alone; in the latter case what will distinguish a Jew from a Mussulman, religion or physiognomy? If in Palestine there shall be established a nation of men and women occupying that land, and the form of government or the character of religion of the country shall be determined by them, the Jew wonders what is meant by Jewish National Homeland. In November, 1930, the Hadassah women of America declared that our protest against the Passfield White Paper has taken the form of a renewed avowal to serve the cause of rebuilding our national home in Palestine. This organization claims a membership of 35,000 American women. Do these women mean that the women of the Jewish faith in America have determined to make Palestine *their* National Home? Do all these women really intend to make the sacrifice for the rebuilding of their National Home in Palestine by foregoing the advantages of living on the Hudson, and assuming the labor of Halutzim? The answer from these women to the

THE WONDERING JEW

question is found in the "resolution" adopted: "We, the delegates of Hadassah, resolve to rededicate ourselves to the achievement of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. We resolve that our answer to the White Paper shall be no verbal protest, but shall take the form of raising funds and more funds—We resolve to assume the raising of money this year as a solemn and exalted obligation." Chaim Trask wonders if a nation composed of us living on the Hudson can be established in Palestine by raising funds and more funds. The efforts of these women of America remind one of the knight who sallied forth to battle against the windmills in defense of the bar maid who he persuaded himself to imagine was "her ladyship." The modern Jew has studied history in the university instead of Yeshivah, and he knows that freedom and equality were never purchased with "funds"; he knows that while armies march on their bellies, rebels march on their souls; and he wonders why our people fail to understand that no kind of national homeland will ever be established in Palestine or in any other country with "funds." To establish a homeland, the people occupying a land must pledge "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor," and as rebels they must fight for their freedom. Only the muzhiks and the Negroes had freedom imposed upon them. All other peoples secured the blessings of liberty through rebellion.

Jerome Bishop, the son of Abraham and Sarah Levy, in New York, wonders how to reconcile Jewish nationalism with the idea of Rabbi Solomon Goldman who said, "We are not fanatically addicted to any nation—our national extra-territoriality makes us internationalists—we are capable of judging economic, social, and political issues by their merit unencumbered by the historic dogmas,

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

prejudices, and biases of those whose egos are shot through with national self-consciousness." Jerome Bishop would like to know whether all Jews are ready to declare to the world that they are internationalists, or whether it is not true that the Jew loves his native land as much as does the Christian. He has seen Jewish Americans drive their bayonets through the bellies of Jewish Germans during the late war with as much gusto as Christian Germans have done towards Christian Englishmen.

This Jerome Bishop knows that his great-grandfather participated in the business of serving notice upon England on July 4, 1776, that "these united colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent, and are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown." Now he wonders why some rabbis expect him to beg at the rear door of this same English Crown for the privilege of becoming a British colonist in Palestine. He wonders if the time should ever come when as such British colonist he should conceive the idea of tossing his gefilteh fish into the Jordan rather than pay a tax that England might have chosen to impose upon him, he would be able to do so as freely as his grandfather tossed the tea into Boston Harbor. He is willing to admit that "egos shot through with national self-consciousness" are not capable of clear thinking, and he rebels against the effort of Jewish nationalists to develop in him just such national consciousness.

Arnold Jacobson, of Kalamazoo, Michigan, knows that the Jews of the South, under the leadership of Judah P. Benjamin, joined the Christians in the promulgation of the proposition that the people of every state had the right to determine whether they will continue to form part of one nation consisting of all the people of the United States, or withdraw from the union and be a

THE WONDERING JEW

separate nation. He knows that Jews of the North have contributed considerably of their lives and fortunes towards establishing the principle that this nation shall remain one and indivisible. Now he wonders how he would maintain the position that he and the other Jews can consistently submerge themselves "into some nationalistic particular group" and refuse to "barter his own nationalism for another." He wonders if he still is part of the American nation, and if not, how has he become expatriated.

The average Jew would like to know whether Jews are the only people who are scattered all over the world or whether Catholics, Presbyterians, and Baptists too are so scattered. He knows that wherever he finds a Jew he also finds a Presbyterian, and whenever he runs across a Catholic he can spy a Jew in the offing. This poor wondering soul has found that as he climbs the family tree of a Bergson, a Freud, a Darwin, and a Huxley, he discovers the ancestors of all of them on the top branch scrapping over a coconut. Now he wants to know whether there is any real difference, biologically, between himself and the Unitarian gentleman who lives next door.

Sixteen million people in all earnestness would like to know what Judaism is and how one can be or become a Jew. They all know that ability to speak Hebrew will not make a person a Jew any more than ability to speak Greek makes one a Greek. They know that a perfunctory attendance at temple services on Friday night does not constitute one a Jew any more than such attendance at a Catholic church on a Sunday morning will make one a Catholic. They all wonder what purpose in life Jews propose to accomplish, and what sacrifices a Jew is expected to make in life to help realize anything that cannot be

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

realized by humanity as a whole. With Socrates, every one of these sixteen million ask, "What is it all about?"

The average Jew has heard a good deal about certain Social Justice that we propose to promote, and he wonders what Jewish Social Justice laws any Jewish congressman or legislator in the United States has ever proposed in any legislative assembly, except, perhaps the law regulating the sale of Bussor-Kosher put through the legislatures of New York and Illinois by over-zealous representative Jews, but he knows that that is not social justice at all, but tends to establish precedents of legislation involving religious questions and is an effort to secure Christian aid in compelling Jews to observe the Torah.

The Marshals, the Jacksons, and the Browns of New York and Chicago, all children of Israel, know that for many decades their ancestors have marched forward under the Star Spangled Banner with one hundred million other Americans, ever striving to, and reasonably succeeding, in making these United States truly "The Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave." Now they wonder whether they ought to harken to the voice of their alleged modern prophets, and face about to march back to the Kingdom of Solomon with his concubines, his palaces, and his divine rights of kings.

The Dreyfuses in France are conscious of the many sacrifices their ancestors have made in that land to establish freedom of thought and abolish distinction on account of birth, blood, or divine ordination. Now they wonder if they ought to replace the Marseillaise with the Hatikvah and return to the ancient Kings with their jawbones of asses as instruments for slaughter of human beings.

Searching through Jewish Literature in the hope of

THE WONDERING JEW

finding some light on the subject of Judaism, a Jew runs across a book entitled, *As a Jew Sees Jesus*, and he reads that the Jewish world will move towards a progressive appreciation of Jesus "but only if the Christian world will forget his divinity and will turn its back on the whole abacadabra of medieval theology." He wonders what is meant by a "Jewish World" and "Medieval Theology." If we can so closely approach our Christian neighbors, are we justified in demanding of them that they turn their backs on medieval theology while we articulately adhere to our ancient theology which dates back even farther than theirs?

The modern Jew readily accepts the confession of Dr. Alexander Lyon, in which he declares, "I am not a Jewish nationalist. My nationality is American." But when the Doctor adds that, "Religiously I am a Jew," the modern Jew wonders just how one can be religiously a Jew without being able to state what his religion is, and what makes it Jewish. A Jew of today should be pardoned if he develops a curiosity to understand the religion of his rabbi; in fact, he would like to tell his rabbi that he has learned all about the history of the human race, that he is acquainted with the literature of different peoples, that he can read book reviews written by very competent reviewers; but he wants his rabbi to tell him whether Jewish religion consists of an understanding of the beliefs of the Jews of old or in having some theological belief of one's own. He also would like to be told how Jewish beliefs differ from the beliefs of others. The Jew of today refuses to accept Judaism without question; he insists on its being weighed and measured by the same scales and standards as are employed in the weighing and measuring of other religions; he would like to get a look

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

at Jewish religion; he would like to turn it around, examine it, and get at a rational understanding of it.

Rabbi George Leiken at Ottawa, Canada, to illustrate the truth that the Jew of today is not the Jew of yesteryear, relates a story about certain bells in a carillon in that city which became useless as a result of constant polishing. He pointed out to his congregation that the polishing to which the Jew had been treated or to which he had treated himself, had robbed him of his tone. As far as civilization was concerned, he was dead. The thoughtful Jew reading this analogy wonders if the polishing to which Christians had been submitted during the last one hundred years did not affect them in the same way. He wonders if the Christian, too, is not religiously dead so far as civilization is concerned.

"A generation or two ago," said Cardinal Mundelein, "the majority of the American people were believers; they clung to certain fundamental truths as necessary for salvation; but today, even the preachers in the pulpit are shedding those one by one, like coverings that hamper their freedom. Revealed religion is receding into the dim distance; its place is being taken by an appeal to sentimentality on one hand, or to rationalism on the other."

The Jew of today wonders if the rabbis and the cardinals would like people to retrace their steps and return to the "tone" when Jews excommunicated Spinoza and imprisoned Jeremiah and the Christians kept the torture implements of the Inquisition working overtime. The average Jew realizes, in the words of President Hoover, that, "the problems with which we are confronted are the problems of growth and progress. In their solution we have to determine the facts, to develop the relative importance to be assigned to such facts, to formulate a

THE WONDERING JEW

common judgment upon them, and to realize solutions in a spirit of conciliation." This may not meet with the approval of mythologists and metaphysicists, but as applied to human progress and social relations, nothing can lead to greater achievement than the understanding of facts involved and the rendering of a judgment based upon the facts involved, mellowed by conciliation.

The Jew of 1933 is not wondering any longer about the coming of the Messiah or the New Exodus, but about the real differences which exist between him and his neighbor, and about methods and means by which equality could be achieved without surrender or conquest, but by understanding and adjustment.

CHAPTER III

VOX POPULI

NOTWITHSTANDING the many Jewish scientists, Jewish historians, Jewish encyclopedists, and Jewish historical, literary, and educational societies, there is not an authoritative source to which one could turn for information on the subject of Jewishness. We may all worship at the shrine of Professor Einstein as a great scientist, and yet most Jews will not accept his statement that "race" is a humbug, and that it is impossible for anyone who is pervaded with the sense of causal law in all that happens, to entertain the idea of a Being who interferes with the sequences of events in the world. We may all find pride in the fact that Spinoza was a great philosopher, but the orthodox Jews refuse to go to his philosophy for instruction on the subject of religion. We speak with bated breath about the genius of Maimonides, but the modern Jews refuse to accept his definition of what the Jewish religion really is.

No political, economic, or social philosophy that ever confronted mankind failed to receive a rational consideration from the Jews. It is their proud boast that they have ever contributed towards the solution of human problems in thought, in worldly goods, or in life and blood. Jews intelligently discuss the League of Nations, the World Court, Prohibition, the Soviets, and the Freedom of the Seas, but present them with the question involving their Jewishness, and they listen with as much attention as does the Hindu when you speak to him of the unhygienic consequences of bathing in the Ganges River. The Jewish mind seems to consist of two separate divi-

sions; one part is fully rational, capable of absorbing knowledge and culture, and of dealing intelligently with every sort of human problem, while the other part is obsessed with notions held fast by a blind belief in ancient traditions. In a general way Jews sometimes realize that empires were founded and overthrown, and republics established by other peoples; they may have a glimmer of an idea that finance, commerce and industry have been, and are being developed by people who are not at all Jews; they may even admit that men who were not in the Jewish fold have built railroads, invented steamships and airplanes, made scientific discoveries and promoted far reaching developments. There might flit across their minds the realization that non-Jews have written great novels and immortal poems, painted famous pictures, composed fine music, and produced world renowned dramas; but when a Jewish mind views these achievements with relation to Jews, they all fade into insignificance. Such names as Homer, Plato, Socrates, Milton, Darwin, Huxley, and Spencer, are of no particular significance, from a Jewish standpoint, compared to Spinoza or Einstein. Listening to Jews, one would imagine that poems by Tennyson, paintings by Cezanne, novels by Hugo, history by Carlyle, and philosophy by Rousseau, have no special value; while the achievement by Einstein is "Jewish" science, writing by Wasserman is "Jewish" literature, accomplishment by Disraeli is "Jewish" statesmanship, composition by Rubenstein is "Jewish" music, and acting by Sarah Bernhardt is "Jewish" art. No Jew would for one moment admit that the discoveries of Thomas Edison are Christian science, or that the writing of the Declaration of Independence was the result of seventeen centuries of Christian civilization. None of us

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

would tolerate a suggestion that the overthrow of despotism was accomplished by any religious or ethnic group, or that "We Christians" won the World War.

For want of any recognized authority, we must go to the articulate portion of Jewry and endeavor to learn what Jewishness is considered by it to be. Citations of Jewish opinion on the subject could be gathered from inexhaustible sources; but multiplying them would not lend any strength to the argument. The opinion of one expert is as dependable as are the opinions of many, particularly if the subject concern itself with a common phenomenon. Judaism of today does not involve the same technical elements that were involved in the Judaism of a hundred years ago. It is precisely for this reason that we present so few authorities to illustrate the diversity of opinion among Jewry as a whole. The opinion of a rabbi in Chicago or Oshkosh is as dependable as is the opinion of a rabbi in Paris or Barcelona. Chicago and New York, with their extensive Jewish populations, and Cincinnati, with its rabbinical college, are places from which Jewish opinion is as general and identical as would come from any other place.

Dr. Kohler of the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati, in an attempt to distinguish between Judaism and Jewishness, says: "The Creed is a condition *sine qua non* of the Christian church. To disbelieve its dogmas is to cut oneself loose from membership. Judaism is quite different. The Jew is born into it and cannot extricate himself from it even by renunciation of his faith—it is birth, not confession, that imposes on the Jew the obligation to work and strive for the eternal verities of Israel, for the preservation and propagation of which he has been chosen by God—Judaism does not denote Jewish nationality, it

should not be presented as a religion of pure theism aiming to unite all believers in one God, Judaism is nothing less than a message concerning the one and only Holy God, a message entrusted by divine revelation to the Jewish people."

The Hebrew Union College has been established, and is being maintained, for the purpose of preparing men for the rabbinate, and Dr. Kohler should be presumed to know his subject. Whether one reads the doctor's statement from right to left or from left to right, one cannot arrive at the conclusion that the Jews are a nation, for he specifically says that Judaism does not denote nationality. If Judaism "is nothing less than a message concerning the one and only God," the term race could not be applied to people who are entrusted by divine revelation to carry the message.

If Judaism should not be presented as a religion of pure theism aiming to unite all believers in one God, what shall we do with this fervent prayer of Dr. Kohler? "May the time not be far, O God, when Thy name shall be worshipped in all the earth . . . when all inhabitants of the earth shall perceive that to Thee alone every knee must bend . . . when all created in Thine image shall recognize that they are brethren, so that they, one in spirit, and one in fellowship, may be forever united before Thee." The Doctor would have us believe that a Jew is born into Judaism and is endowed by God with the duty to carry a message. Where is there a Jew who will not rebel against the assertion that birth constitutes one a privileged character? What Jew does not know that birth does not constitute one a messenger, nor does it entail the assumption of a duty to carry a message?

If Judaism should not be presented as a pure theism,

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

then of course, Judaism cannot be designated as a message concerning the one and only God, for there can be no purer theism than the belief in one God. If Judaism is a belief in God, then every man who so believes should be designated as a Jew, while every man who disavows a belief in one God should at once cease to be a Jew. No rabbi would concede this argument, and yet there are hundreds of rabbis and Unitarian ministers whose beliefs are as identical as the beliefs of any two Catholics or any two Jews. To say that a person at his birth has imposed upon him a duty "to work and strive for the eternal verities" of anything, is to reaffirm divine authority conferred upon preferred human beings and thus rob the mind of all freedom. Are we not agreed by now that the idea of privilege or responsibility by reason of birth is buried forever?

Professor Dubnow, a well known Jewish historian, in an address at Zurich, said, "After the peace treaties have officially recognized the East European Jewish groups as minorities, whose rights are under the protection of the League of Nations, it is necessary to form a Jewish international organization to coordinate all the efforts to protect these rights in the different countries—Poland, Roumania, Austria, Hungary, and Lithuania. The German minority in Poland, Italy, or Czechoslovakia can appeal to Germany's representative in the League. The Jews have no representative in the League and, therefore, must unite into one solid body which will serve as the Jewish mediator and seek to bring about complete fulfillment of the guarantees of the rights of minorities vouchsafed in the Treaty of Versailles."

From this statement one might come to the conclusion that Jews are minorities in every country, but he goes on

to say, "It must be admitted that the Jews are, in all countries, at least a religious minority." This brings us to more confusion, for no religious group ever received minority rights in any country and there are no representatives of religious groups in the League of Nations. There is quite a difference between a national minority and a religious group. Minority rights are involved only where a given territory is seized by a conquering nation and annexed to its own, bringing the natives under the rule of the conqueror. If there is a German minority in Poland, it is because a particular part of Poland belonged to Germany and was populated by Germans. When the territory was declared part of Poland, the German citizens who preferred to remain such became the minority, and, under the terms of the treaty, are entitled to enjoy certain rights which the Polish government is bound to protect as long as these citizens continue to remain Germans, without regard to their religious opinions. These Germans remaining in their own homeland have a right to hope that, sooner or later, Germany will again acquire the land and restore them to normal citizenship. Before the World War, Frenchmen in Alsace-Lorraine, not as Catholics, Protestants, or Jews, but as Frenchmen, were the minority group because that territory had been taken from the French by the Germans; after the World War, the Germans on that same territory became the minority group because the land reverted to the French. The Bretons in Brittany consider themselves a national minority because at one time Brittany was a sovereign Duchy, but afterwards was annexed to France so that its existence as a nation was destroyed. These Bretons have not left their country and dispersed into the diaspora. They are still in their native land, there they will remain until

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

they shall have secured for themselves their independence, and have made Brittany once more their "legally constituted and publicly recognized national homeland." One could continue to cite many such illustrations of minority groups everywhere, but one could never find a religious group claiming minority rights, except in countries where state and church are still one. To say, therefore, that the Jews are a religious minority completely destroys their claim to minority group recognition in any country.

The World Union of Jewish Youth, meeting in Strassburg, as reported in the B'nai B'rith magazine, declared that they did not regard Judaism as a religious creed in the sense in which it is understood by Western opinion, that is, a collection of dogmas and principles which bind a group of individuals with the bonds of faith. If such had been the conception they would have objected to its being applied to them in whom the religious sentiment is lacking and who have stated in perfect sincerity that they do not think it is necessary to have such faith. Their union is based on the essential point, the unity of the Jewish people, the only principle which places them in accord with historic reality.

The Jewish Youth entirely eliminates from the term "Judaism" the religious element and accepts, what it calls, the "essential point," the unity of the Jewish people. This attitude of the Jewish Youth presents the question: Is Judaism merely a union of individuals scattered all over the globe, having no purpose except that of just being Jews? The answer to the inquiry comes from Mrs. Jacob Grossman of Flushing, New York, reported in the Chicago Tribune, who laments that the Jewish home, as we knew it in our childhood, is no more; there are too many forces of interest for the modern child to accept his Jew-

ishness unquestionably, and the need of living the Jewish life.

According to this lady, Judaism consists in "living the Jewish life." It follows that "Jew" means a person who lives a certain kind of life. What is that life? Does it consist in belonging to a Jewish club, maintaining a Jewish church, or using some expressions that are particularly Jewish? On one hand, we have an admission that religion does not form any part of Judaism, that the subject of faith is entirely lacking, that the only distinguishing characteristic is the unity of the Jewish people; on the other hand, it is claimed that Jewishness consists in living the Jewish life, and that too is fading out.

Mr. Herbert S. Golden reported in the same newspaper, speaking of the conditions of Jewry in America, declared: If Judaism is to live, conservative, orthodox, and reform elements must unite in an educational campaign. "The synagogue must again become the center of all Jewish activities." Are we willing to accept the responsibilities involved in reviving the influence of the synagogue? Is any modern Jew ready to go back to the belief in the Torah? Will the members of the World Union of Jewish Youth support such a movement after they have declared themselves entirely lacking in religious sentiment? If a "congress" were assembled today, attended by Judge Brandeis, Dr. Louis Mann, Leon Trotzky, Dr. Weitzman, Professor Einstein, and all the others who frequently are heard to speak for, and on behalf of Jewry, would they agree to restore the religion of our forefathers? The answer to the question is too obvious to require elucidation.

Dr. S. M. Melamed, in supporting a movement to establish a Jewish university in America, contends that

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

because the Jews are a *subject race*, and since the Catholics, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians have universities, the American Jews, who in this country are a *religious group only*, also ought to have a university of their own. It is inconceivable why in this country, Jews should be designated as a "religious group only," while generally they should be treated as a subject race. As a race they have no such need for a university as the Presbyterians have, who are unquestionably a religious organization. The Presbyterians, whom no one ever designated as a race, endeavor to inculcate their creed in the minds of the students of their colleges. What kind of creed do we propose to teach the students of a Jewish university if we had one? If not creed, what shall we teach them that may be classified as Jewish education? Professor Albert Einstein, regretting that the universities of Europe are for the most part the nurseries of Chauvinism, expresses the hope that "a Jewish university in Palestine will always be free from this evil; that teachers and students will preserve the consciousness that they serve their people best when they maintain its union with humanity and with the highest human values." The very term, Jewish university, implies a curriculum that will result in the development of Chauvinism.

Rabbi Louis Mann of Sinai Temple, Chicago, at a public gathering in 1928, attended by Jews and non-Jews, called for the purpose of giving an opportunity to representatives of all religious denominations to present their respective creeds, speaking for the Jewish people, said: "Judaism is not a theology, but a way of life." This statement was accepted by Jews and non-Jews without protest, and was taken as expressive of Jewish opinion. "Not a theology" means that Judaism is not a science of

God or of religion; it is not a science which treats of the existence, character, and attributes of God and His laws, it is not theism and does not involve the message that there is only one Holy God. The term, "way of life," has been generally accepted by Jewry as a complete answer to the inquiry, What is Jewish religion.

No intelligent rabbi would assume that "Jewish way of life" is manifested in the maintenance of delicatessen stores or kosher bussor shops. He would not admit that the Jewish way of life is expressed in attendance at temple on Yom Kippur; or in membership in a Jewish country club. But he would claim that all of these little things when taken together constitute the "Jewish way of life." As long as the Torah was considered divine and the observance of it was deemed the obligation of the Jew, all of his practices, customs, and traditions, even his idiosyncrasies, went to make up his way of life; but when the Torah ceases to be the controlling element in the life of a Jew, his insincere and soulless performances of ancient customs are the last gasps of a dying religious group. There is not one thing of vital significance in the Jewish life that is universal among all the Jews, and the daily life of the average Jew does not differ from the life of a Unitarian or an Agnostic. Our way of life is not superior to the way of life of our neighbors, and no Jew could teach his neighbor to live our way of life, even if the neighbor should choose to do so.

Rabbi Gerson B. Levi, admitting that "it is not possible for the children to follow in all the ways of the fathers," submits that "the attitude toward life which, after all, was the principal thing in Judaism and not the many customs and forms, ought to be maintained." Judaism, he says, has a positive attitude. It has principles of life

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

that it tries to express, and the thing which he considers most important, and which a positive Judaism would not put up with is a makeshift Yom Kippur. He seems to arrive at the conclusion that these positive attitudes of Judaism should be expressed by the Jews gathering in the temples and synagogues, "learning of the condition of Jewry today, of its problems, and learning of their responsibilities as men and women of a rising generation who will soon have to assume full obligation and responsibility for the tradition of an ancient people." The Rabbi fails to point out the difference between a makeshift Yom Kippur and a makeshift Sabbath; and Yom Kippur is in the last analysis nothing but a Jewish custom which has lost its entire significance today. One would imagine that a rabbi who often is heard to say, "Praised be Thou, O Lord, our God, Ruler of the world, at Whose word the shadows of evening fall, and by Whose will the gates of morn are opened," would be able to understand that the maintenance of a house of worship, the employment of a person learned in theology, the religious services every Friday evening or Saturday morning, and the observance of Yom Kippur are not the expression of a way of life, but involve the religion of the rabbi and his congregation.

Often one hears the claim that the Jewish way of life is expressed in the maintenance of charitable institutions, and generally in the charitable functions of every Jew. This element in Jewish life, which is by far the most conspicuous, has been condemned by Theodor Herzl, as a devastating disease rather than a virtue. "I regard charity," he says, "as a thoroughly false principle. Among no other people is there so much charity and so much beggary as among the Jews. This suggests cause and

effect. Dragging farmers to the Argentine must result in their conceiving that they established claims for further support which would not encourage the desire for labor. Charity destroys the people's character." And yet, through the various charitable organizations, the Jew, from his childhood, is trained to accept charity without humility. Jewish parents do not hesitate to send their children to summer camps maintained by charitably disposed persons even though hundreds of thousands of children manage to grow up without the aid of such camps, learning to depend upon themselves. Dragging Jews to Palestine or to summer camps produces the same result as dragging them to the Argentine; it destroys their characters. "Charity," says the author of the *Epic of America*, "is a cloak of respectability which men seek to wear to cover up their shortcomings. A man may be a pirate in business and a beneficent God in bestowing gifts on some pet charitable institution."

It is a notorious fact that the education of the average Polish Jew, except on the subject of his Bible and his Talmud, is almost negligible, but there are some who have graduated from universities and have become doctors and lawyers. The notions of these men on the subject of Judaism are deserving of some consideration. The B'nai B'rith magazine published the fact that in Poland new lawyers are sworn according to a religious ritual. For Christians there is a Christian ritual, and for Jews there is a Jewish oath. In February, 1930, there were twenty Jews to be admitted to the bar of Warsaw. Twelve of those Jews took the Catholic oath. Jewry was shocked and mourned for them as for the dead. "Oh, but we are still Jews," said the twelve converts. "Religiously we belong to another persuasion, but racially we are still Jews."

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Racially we shall continue our activities in Jewish affairs." But the Jewry of Warsaw answered, "they have rejected the faith; they are no longer our brethren. They cannot be of us." There then rages in Warsaw the old question, what is a Jew? There are those Jews who like to say, "to be a Jew is a racial or national identity, and religion has nothing to do with it. One may believe or not believe."

Even if there were no other proof of the confusion among Jews upon the subject of Judaism, the foregoing should be enough to confound any thinking person. Surely no one can fail to appreciate the difference between race, nation, and religion, and yet "Jewish" lawyers in Warsaw fail to note the absurdity in the statement. "We have accepted Christianity as our religion but racially we are still Jews."

At every service, Reform Rabbis can be heard to say, "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be upon thy heart; thou shall teach them diligently unto thy children, and shall speak of them when thou sittest in thy house, when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the doorposts of thy house, and upon thy gates." "These words" always were understood to mean the commandments, the statutes, and the ordinances which fill the many chapters of the Bible. The duty to teach the observance of these statutes is one of the most important and repeated of the commandments which, according to the Talmud, God multiplied upon Israel for His name's sake and for Israel's glory. Following this command of the Lord, the Jewish children were ever sent to Cheder

VOX POPULI

(Hebrew School) and there taught not mathematics, chemistry, or any other science, but the Torah and the Talmud and the duty of every Jew strictly to observe all the commandments therein contained.

Today when the Reform Rabbi concludes the recitation of "these words," he invites the hearers to send their children to the temple Sunday School where they will be taught, not the word of God, not the obligation to observe all his statutes and all his commandments, but Jewish history, Jewish philosophy and Jewish literature.

Dr. Emanuel Gamoran, Educational Director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, submitting a new curriculum for Jewish Religious Schools of Tomorrow, speaks not a word about God, anthropomorphic or otherwise, and nothing about the observance of the Torah. The primary grades, he says, should concern themselves with a study of the immediate Jewish environment of the child to whatever extent it still is Jewish. The Doctor, of course, means that there shall be a study of the environment of the child living on Maxwell Street, in Chicago, as well as the child living in Rogers Park. Jewish customs and ceremonies, he says, offer an opportunity for rich experience. In the intermediate grades the center of gravity should be the synagogue, the local Jewish community, and the Jews of America.

Such Jewish education is responsible for intelligent men and women, belonging to Reform Temples, declaring that the Temple is not a religious institution, attendance at Friday evening services is not a religious function, and the observance of Yom Kippur and Rosh-a-Shonah is not religion. All this is purely the preservation of ancient tradition and constitutes the Jewish way of life. "But does not God enter into this at all?" The answer invari-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

ably is, "No! God has nothing to do with it and one need not even believe in his existence. All that we have to teach our children to make them grow up as good Jews, is Jewish history."

Raphael H. Levine, in the *Jewish Layman*, of September, 1930, speaking of Jewish history and tradition, says: "Joseph was sold into slavery and became a prince in Egypt and Samson slew a thousand Philistines with the jawbone of a mule. This is Jewish history." To call this Jewish history is as legitimate as to call the story of Robinson Crusoe Gentile history. Mankind has learned, in the language of Mr. Dewey, that the most sacred responsibility of a man's life is to endeavor to think well; to think without strict regard to the antecedents and consequences of thought; to accept ready-made and unanalyzed concepts as premises of thinking, or to fail to test one's ideas by working out their results is to be intellectually irresponsible. Any school boy knows that the fables and myths in the Bible are not the history of any people and our acceptance of these stories as history demonstrates that on matters Jewish, we do not think very well. The story of Samson killing a thousand Philistines with the jawbone of a mule should be part of an edition deluxe of Baron Munchausen together with the rest of the Bible stories and miracles.

The late Rabbi Emil Hirsch of Chicago, indicated at least in part, how little historic value there is in the Bible when he said, "They tell you that Moses never lived. I acquiesce. If they tell me that the story that came from Egypt is mythology, I shall not protest; it is mythology. They tell me that the book of Isaiah, as we have it today, is composed of writings of at least three and perhaps four different periods; I knew it before they ever told

me; before they knew it, it was my conviction."

In a sermon preached before the Temple Isaiah-Israel, Chicago, a rabbi said, "—Judaism has again taken sides between works and faith, between conduct and belief, between deed and creed. Judaism definitely selects works, conduct, and deed. Let man work, let man achieve, let him struggle, whatever his beliefs, but if men have this one thought, that through their deeds and through their conduct they will make their lives worthwhile, then they are asserting the Jewish principle." This is typical of the present day Jewish rabbi. "Whatever his belief, let man work" is Rotarian bosh and not Jewish or any other kind of religion. All men know that through their conduct and through their deeds they can make of their lives one thing or another, and it is not at all necessary to build imposing temples and retain high priced rabbis to extol these doctrines.

A reform rabbi in Chicago recently was asked by this writer, "What must I believe in order to become a member of your congregation?" "Nothing at all," said the rabbi. "But I must be a Jew in order to be a member of your temple. What will constitute me a Jew?" "Your statement that you are a Jew makes you one. If you say that you are a Jew you are one. That is all there is to it," answered the rabbi, who occupies one of the most prominent pulpits in Chicago. This recalls the interview between Abraham Lincoln and a committee who called on him to ask that he issue a proclamation declaring the Negroes free. "Suppose you call a rabbit's tail a leg, how many legs will the rabbit have?" he asked them. "Why, five, Mr. President." "No," said the President, "Calling a tail a leg does not make it a leg."

The present day Jewish religious idea is epitomized

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

in the language of Mr. Ludwig Lewisohn: "The Christian world whose religion is divided from its national culture has lost the conception of an autonomous national faith." It follows that it is disastrous for any nation to separate its state from its church, a doctrine to which no Jew would subscribe. "We Jews," continues the writer, "need not believe in our religion even as enlightened Greeks did not believe in Gods and oracles . . . The Torah and the prophets, the wisdom books and legends of later ages . . . these are our Iliads and Nibelungen Lays; they express our national character, our essentially eternal traits . . . The Jew need believe nothing!" If the Torah is our Iliad, why parade it in the house of worship? If all the wisdom of the Talmud is our Nibelungen Lays, why clothe it with divinity? If we need believe nothing, why talk to us about Abraham, Moses and Noah? Why talk about Jewish Temples, Synagogues and Rabbis if we need not believe anything? "The Jew," continues the author, "when he reads of Joseph asking concerning the old man, his father, and weeping; when he reads that the ground must lie fallow every seventh year for the poor and must not be held in perpetuity since it is God's; when he reads of the Jubilee year in which all wrongs are to be righted and every man returned unto his own; when he reads that a young poet and musician was chosen to be king; when he reads these things he comes home to his people and himself. For these ideas and events express his innermost self; they are today, as they have been in the past, the exact image of his innate character and modes of thought . . ." This may or may not be the Jew's innate character and mode of thought, but it certainly is not his conduct.

Jews have never anywhere during the last twenty cen-

turies allowed the ground to lie fallow for the poor; they have never had a Jubilee year in which they permitted every man to return unto his own, they never proposed a law against holding land in perpetuity, not even in Palestine, and during the last quarter of a century, while being in absolute control of many wards in Chicago and New York, they have not once elected a poet or musician to public office. Presumably one can make all these vague declarations because "we do not have to believe anything."

A very enlightening anonymous article in the Jewish Social Service Quarterly of September, 1930, entitled "Facing Reality," completely refutes Mr. Lewisohn's Judaism. "An unbiased and clear cut analysis of Jewishness," says the author, "has in the past, and will continue in the future, to reveal that there is nothing inherently unique or different in that phase of group life . . . There is absolutely no agreement on what 'Jewishness' is. There are as many conceptions as there are Jews . . . It has largely been the Jews' own strong separatist inclinations which have built for them the ghetto life and the ghetto spirit against which they have launched their frequent bombardment—futile as long as they insist upon being different and refuse to lose their identity. Were there values, so different and so unique, which only a Jew, as a Jew, could enjoy, there would be no quarrels with attempting to maintain a condition which has its basis entirely in persecution. Unfortunately, 'Jewishness' holds out nothing which cannot be secured or duplicated by merging or assimilating in the larger mass of world humanity. Evidence has not yet been established that Jewish art, Jewish music, Jewish philosophy, Jewish ethics, the Jewish attack upon life, is different from that of the other religious or ethnic groups."

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Mr. Lewisohn, speaking of Jewish art, says, "In the house of the Kehillah of Warsaw there is a small museum in which are preserved examples of Jewish craftsmanship dating from the sixteenth century on. There are spice-shakers, Chanukah candlesticks, wine pitchers and flasks, platters for the dedication and release of the first born, shields, beads and crowns for the adornment of the Torah scrolls, book-bindings, illuminated manuscripts and wedding certificates, rings and elaborate embroideries." What are the values of this Jewish art compared with the art of Italians, Germans, Spaniards and Americans of every faith including those of the Jewish faith, which fills the museums of the world? There is no Jewish art any more than there is Presbyterian or Mohammedan art or even Christian art. The "art treasures" which Mr. Lewisohn discovered are the products of Jews of Poland, who but for their religious beliefs were as much Poles as were those who produced ikons and crosses which adorn the Christian churches.

It might be well to snatch a view of the attitude of the Gentile mind on the subject of Jewishness as illustrative of the general absence of understanding on the subject. Charles Edward Russell, described in a Jewish publication as a noted historian and economist, in an article entitled, "Wanted: Jews in Politics," reported by the Jewish Telegraph Agency, complains that "the Jews in politics are just nothing." He would resent the participation of Catholics in politics as a class; he would find fault with the Methodists as a class for the influence they wield in American legislative halls; he appreciates the danger in religious or ethnic groups acting as a class in politics, but while admitting that the Jews "are not aliens sojourning for a time in a strange land" and that "this country is

their home and their children's home and will be," he urges the Jews to act in politics as a class. Should they act as a religious, racial, or national class? Would the Russells agree that the Catholics, the Protestants, the Nordics, and the Teutons in the United States should act as separate classes in politics? Within what group would we expect to find the Russells of America? The article concludes with the statement that "We need in public affairs in this country the strong asset of the Jewish ethics, and we need at all times the spirit of democracy that breathes through the Jewish sacred writings and is apparent in Jewish history and traditions." The author seems to be oblivious to the fact that after more than twenty centuries of "sacred writings," Spinoza was driven out of his native city by the Jews and Servetus was burned to death, and Galileo was shut up in prison for life by the Christians. What Russell the historian proves is that like the Jew, the Gentile does not know what the Jews in reality are.

Speaking of what the Jews formerly were, Max Radin, in *The Life of the People in Biblical Times*, says; "They thought the bond that united them and distinguished them from others to be a religious bond and not one of blood. When somewhere in the Syrian desert certain nomad tribes embraced with enthusiasm the strange and new worship of Sinai, they entered into what seemed to them a solemn covenant. As men of the covenant, they invaded and conquered the better part of Palestine."

One thing the modern articulate Jew studiously avoids is the consideration of Jewish religion with the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an indispensable ingredient. At a national conference of Jews and Christians held in Washington, D. C. in February, 1932, for the purpose

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

of discussing present day religious problems, the Jewish representatives confined themselves largely to a discussion of the dissolution of racial prejudices and the influences of these prejudices on the economic, social, and civic relations in the United States. The Jews did not urge upon the conference the unity of all men under the leadership of one God and consolidation of all religious organizations into one great brotherhood of men.

They did not proclaim, in order to dissolve racial prejudice, that they are ready to accept a program which will include the marriage of Jewish sons to Negro daughters and Nordic daughters to Mongolian sons. They did not offer to open the doors of their country clubs to Teutons, Negroes and Mongolians. The only thing these Jews did seek to bring about, is the conversion of the Christians to the idea that every Jew should be accepted into membership of every college fraternity and every social club without discrimination; even including those Jews who are daily being rejected by Jewish fraternities and clubs.

The attitude of Jews at this conference, like at many others of that sort, was that, while they are the chosen people, the ancient race, the 100% separatists, the Christians should nevertheless make every effort to accept them as their equals, and they will agree in return, to recognize the validity of the racial discriminations between whites and blacks; Nordic and Teuton, German Jew and Russian Jew, and between Litvaks and Hungarian Jews.

No matter where our people gather together, except in an orthodox synagogue, the subject of God and the Torah never is given the courtesy of even a passing glance. The thing they are concerned with is some mystical force that would hold them together. Like the rabbis of old, the rabbis of today are groping for that something, and they

seized upon the terms *race* and *nation* as the save-all. The author of *The Growth of Jewish Chicago* says, "Dr. Yudelsohn, a Hebrew scholar endowed with a keen perception, saw that the salvation of American Judaism lay in Jewish nationalism, which could be effected among the Jewish youth of America only through Jewish education." For several decades Jewish social workers have successfully taught the Jews of America to become Americans; how can we teach them to be nationally Jews and Americans at the same time? But even if we could teach the Jewish youth to be conscious of Jewish nationalism, that is, that all Jews constitute one nation, would all Jews accept this program? The majority of Jews in America have repeatedly protested against such teachings and had vehemently insisted that our children should be taught to be Americans nationally, for "our fathers" too died that this nation may be preserved.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, who contends that Palestine should be made sufficiently Jewish to be the center of Jewish national life, speaking of the American nation, says, "God called unto a thousand peoples and summoned the bravest among them . . . and out of the labor of men and the bounty of earth, out of the prayers of men and the hope of the world, God fashioned a nation." These bravest of men came from England and Germany and Russia and Italy; among them were Catholics and Lutherans and Puritans and Jews and Atheists. Even a rabbi would hesitate to suggest that after this God fashioned nation had been formed, the Jews were not part of it or are not part of it now, and that they should be transplanted into Palestine where they would establish a Jewish nation politically and religiously; a condition directly contrary to the ideals upon which this God-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

fashioned nation has been built.

To Theodor Herzl, the Jewish Question did not present the issue of religion or race; to him it was "no more a social than a religious one, notwithstanding that it sometimes takes these and other forms. It is a national question, which can only be solved by making it a political world question to be discussed and controlled by the civilized nations of the world in council. The Jews wish for a state—they shall have it."

It must be admitted that the diversity of opinions among the leading Jews on the subject of Judaism is due primarily to a misunderstanding of the terms employed. Says Mr. David Hume, the great English philosopher, "from this circumstance alone, that a controversy has been long kept on foot and remains still undecided, we may presume that there is some ambiguity in the expression, and that the disputants affix different ideas to the term employed in the controversy. For as the faculties of the mind are supposed to be naturally alike in every individual; otherwise nothing could be more fruitless than to reason or dispute together; it were impossible, if men affix the same ideas to their terms, that they would so long form different opinions of the same subject; especially when they communicate their views, and each party turn themselves on all sides, in search of arguments which may give them the victory over their antagonists. It is true, if men attempt the discussion of subjects which lie entirely beyond the reach of human capacity, they may long beat the air in their fruitless contests and never arrive at any determinate conclusion. But if the question regard any subject of common life and experience, nothing, one would think, could preserve the dispute so long undecided but some ambiguous expressions, which keep the antago-

nists still at a distance, and hinder them from grappling with each other."

The first step in the direction of a solution of the problem confronting us today is the ascertainment of the following:

First: Is there a Jewish nation in existence now or do we propose to gather all the Jews from all the civilized world, place them among the uncivilized Arabs, and there maintain them as a Jewish nation, excluding all men and women who are not Jews?

Second: Is there a Jewish race which can be regarded as distinct from all other races? If so, what are the distinctions which may be taken in consideration in determining the racial status of the Jews?

Third: Are the Jews a religious group? If so, what are the religious ideas which unite them and distinguish them from other groups, and how can these religious ideas be stated so that they may be understood by everyone interested? Are the religious ideas involved in Judaism so diametrically opposed to other religions as to make it difficult for Jews freely to enjoy association with non-Jews? Do all Jews entertain the same religious ideas or ideals?

Concerning any other group of people there is no urgent need to examine into the meaning of religion, race, or nationality, for the reason that these three terms have not become interchangeable as to be indiscriminately employed. Italian does not mean Catholic, and Nordic does not stand for Christian. A Teuton does not pretend to be conscious of any particular religious cult, and a Christian is not conscious of any particular racial attributes. The situation is entirely different as far as the Jewish people are concerned. The word "Jew" is not the anti-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

thesis of Teuton, or Catholic, or German, but is being used to distinguish one as being neither. A German is not a Jew from the Jewish standpoint, and therefore, a Jew is not a German; a Nordic is not a Jew, and therefore, a Jew is not a Nordic. And yet there are as many individuals among the Jews who look like Nordics as there are Nordics who look like Jews. This anomaly forces a careful and rational examination of the meanings of these terms as they are commonly employed.

CHAPTER IV

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

WEBSTER defines religion as the outward act or form by which men indicate their recognition of the existence of a God, or of Gods, having power over their destinies, to whom obedience, service and honor are due; the feeling or expression of human love, fear or awe of some superhuman and overruling power. Any known religious group fits perfectly into this definition; the Christians, the Buddhists, the Mohammedans, and all others, recognize the existence of a God or Gods having power over them and to whom obedience and honor is due. Hence, they have their churches, temples, and mosques, wherein they render the honor and the service to their Gods.

Eight hundred years ago Maimonides defined the Jewish religion as the belief in the existence of a God; in His unity, in His incorporeality, and His insusceptibility to change; in His eternity and existence before the world; in His absolute claims to our adoration; in the prophetic inspiration of chosen men; in Moses as the greatest prophet with whom no other prophet can be compared; in the divinity of the Torah; in its unalterability; in God's providence; in His just rewards and punishments; in the future appearance of the Messiah; and finally in the resurrection of the dead.

Substitute the New Testament or the Koran for the Torah; Jesus or Mohammed for Moses, and this definition of the Jewish religion fits the Christians as well as the Mohammedans. Maimonides added: "No one can be considered a true Jew who does not acknowledge these

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

articles as true; he who denies a single one of them is a heretic, forfeits his membership in the community of Judaism and cuts himself off from all hope of future bliss."

Until the middle of the 18th century practically every Jew lived within the Maimonidean definition of religion; all Jews fitted completely and happily into a unified religious group. Here and there controversies and differences of opinion developed, but they did not involve any doubts of the main tenets of the faith, but trivial points of interpretation of the Torah or Talmud, with the belief in the all-knowing God and the divinity of the Torah unquestioned. Occasionally there would appear a rare individual who would discard the whole faith, but he was indeed a unique figure; he would be promptly excommunicated and would cause not a ripple on the deep calm of Jewish group life.

The Jews of our fathers' days worshipped their God in a manner that left no room for doubt as to the reality of His existence. "Praised be Thou, O Lord, Ruler of the World, Who has chosen us from among all peoples and has given us Thy Law. Infinite as is Thy power, even so is Thy love. By laws and commandments, by statutes and ordinances hast Thou led us into the way of righteousness and brought us to the light of truth. Therefore, at our lying down and our rising up, we meditate on Thy teaching . . . Praised be Thou, O Lord, Who lovest Thy people, Israel." This is a prayer to a conscious personal God who, if he chose, could hear and answer it. Those Jews accepted their Torah as divine law and did not doubt any phase of it. They knew the meaning of the passage: "Ye shall keep all My statutes, and all My ordinances and do them, that the land whither

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

I bring you to dwell therein, vomit you not out."¹

They believed that God was a planning, intelligent, omnipotent Being who created the world in six days, and rested on the seventh; made the first man out of a bit of dust and the first woman out of the man's rib; and He imposed all the sorrow and pain upon mankind because, under Eve's influence, Adam ate of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. They believed that this God sent a flood to cover the whole earth and there destroyed "All flesh that had the breath of life," excepting those in the Ark. They believed that the different languages spoken by different peoples were the result of God's confusing those who were engaged in the building of the Tower of Babel; they believed that Jonah was swallowed by a whale and was spewed out on dry land alive and sound after three days and three nights. They believed that Joshua caused the sun to stand still to enable him to finish a great battle. They believed that God entered into a covenant with Abraham by the terms of which, in consideration of Abraham's agreement to observe the laws of circumcision, the Lord agreed to make of him a great nation and to prefer it as against all other nations, and they believed that God caused Sarah, Abraham's wife, to become pregnant with child at the age of ninety "when it had ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women."

Practically every Jew believed that the provisions in the Bible regulating what he should eat, what festivals he should observe, and in what manner he should abstain from cutting his hair and his beard, constituted the word of the Lord Himself and were to be strictly observed. For thousands of years the only thing about

¹*Leviticus: 20:22.*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

which the Jews were concerned was the preservation of their idea of God and the observance of all His statutes and ordinances. The belief in God and the observance of the Torah was the religion of the Jews, and the study and knowledge of the Torah their aim and purpose in life. No interpretation tending to lessen the force of these statutes was allowed, no deviation from the letter of this law was permitted to go unpunished.

Our forefathers, one might almost say our fathers, believed literally that God said unto Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country unto the land that I will show thee . . . and I will bless them that bless thee and him that curseth thee will I curse . . . lift up now thine eyes, and look northward and southward and eastward and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed forever."² They believed that God appeared before Abraham and said, "I am God Almighty. I will make My covenant between Me and thee . . . and I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojourning, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession."³ They believed that God appeared before Moses and said, "Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob and tell the children of Israel, if ye will keep My covenant, then ye shall be Mine own treasure from among all people and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."⁴ They believed that God said to Moses, "Speak unto the children of Israel and tell them that they observe all My statutes and all My ordinances and do them; I am the Lord." No Jew, believing in God and the Torah, assumed the authority to change one iota in the statutes and ordinances promulgated by his

²*Genesis*: 17.

³*Exodus*: 19.

⁴*Numbers*: 15.

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

Creator. The various provisions of the Torah would have made no greater impression on the Jews than the Sermon on the Mount has left upon the Christians, had the rabbis been content with leaving the Torah to be followed by every man according to the dictates of his conscience; but they overshadowed it with their commentaries until the most beautiful parts of it were lost like the proverbial needle in a haystack.

The rabbis have provided a way in the Talmud to enable a person to avoid the provision in the Torah; "If thou lend money to any of My people, even to the poor with thee, thou shalt not be to him as a creditor; neither shall ye lay upon him interest."⁵ But there is no way to avoid the provision that all Jews "make them, throughout their generations, fringes in the corners of their garments and that they put with the fringe of each corner a thread of blue."⁶ The rabbis have commented upon the length of the threads but they never suggested the folly of the law.

The economic and humane provision, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a Sabbath unto the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any manner of work,"⁷ was so involved in rabbinical construction and interpretation that the day finally became, instead of a day of rest, a day of labor. The observance of the Sabbath in conformity with the Talmud and Midrash involved more exertion than would have been involved in daily labor. It became unlawful to light a match, to make or extinguish a fire, to cook a meal or to carry in a bucket of water. The full extent of these prohibitions can be

⁵*Numbers.*

⁶*Numbers: 15:38.*

⁷*Exodus: 20.*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

realized from this Talmudic statement concerning the meaning of "Thou shalt do no manner of work." "A mendicant stands outside and the master of a house inside. The mendicant passes his hand into the house and puts something into the hand of the master and draws it back. In such a case the mendicant is guilty and the master of the house is free. If the master of the house passes his hand outside and puts a thing into the hand of the mendicant, or takes something out of the mendicant's hand and brings it into the house, the master of the house is culpable and the mendicant is free."⁸ One can readily understand how burdensome the observance of such laws must have become, and how difficult it must have been for Jewish people to carry on their business or professions in countries where Sunday was made the day of rest by custom or secular legislation.

The simple humanitarian provision: "Thou shalt not seethe the kid in its mother's milk,"⁹ was the basis for an intricate maze of commentaries which resulted in the prohibition of the use of butter when eating meat, and required the maintenance of two distinct sets of dishes, kitchen utensils, and tableware, in every Jewish home.

Whatever actuated the provision "Ye shalt not round the corners of your heads, neither shalt thou mar the corners of your beard,"¹⁰ is inexplicable now, but it resulted in the Jew's retaining his virgin beard through his entire life and the wearing of a pair of ringlets at his temples. There was nothing beautiful or hygienic about it, but it tended to distinguish the Jew, by external appearances, from the non-Jewish portion of the inhabitants of the land.

⁸Rodkin's *Talmud, English Edition: Vol. 1, p. 1.*

⁹*Exodus: 35.*

¹⁰*Leviticus 19.*

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

"Whatsoever parteth the hoof and cheweth the cud, ye may eat . . . ye shall not eat of the swine,"¹¹ is an old Egyptian tradition but that was lost sight of, and it was evolved into a system of dietetics that made it impossible for a Jew to sit at one table with a non-Jew. Even today there are Jews who would not partake of food in the homes of their own children for fear that all the Talmudic regulations may not have been fully observed in the preparation of the meal, and in Palestine the Mizrachi bar pupils from the only school available because their fathers do not keep a kosher house.¹²

The Jews believed with Rabbi Moses Ben Nachmani; "We possess three different books; before every other the Bible in which we implicitly believe; then the Talmud, which we hold sacred as an indispensable commentary on the biblical laws; but the third book, which we call Mid-rosh, comprises mere sermons or speeches, which are listened to by Jews but which exercises no authority over them."¹³

The Jews of yesterday in their devout following of the Bible are truly described by Heinrich Heine. "This book is their fatherland, their treasure, their government, their bliss, and their bane. They live within its peaceful boundaries. Herein they exercise their inalienable rights and can never be driven along nor dispersed. Herein they are strong and worthy of admiration. Absorbed in the city of this book, they observed little of the change which went on about them in the real world; nations arose and perished; states flourished and disappeared; revolutions emerged out of the soil; but they lay bowed down over their book and observed nothing of the wild

¹¹*Leviticus: 11.*

¹²*Menorah: Oct., 1929.*

¹³*Rodkin's Talmud: Vol. x., p. 69.*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

tumult which passed over them."

This is the impression of Heine in comparatively recent times, but centuries ago it was even more true. Rabbi Simon Ben Jochai speaking of the public works of the Roman Empire; its spacious market places for the public use; the bridges over rivers; the beautiful baths, which contribute as much to the health as to the enjoyment of the people, cried aloud: "For what purpose are all these works erected, but to gratify their own rapacity and to facilitate their exactions? Why do they build spacious market places, but for the assembling together of harlots to gratify their licentiousness? Their baths are erected only for their own sensual delights; their bridges, that their collectors of tribute may pass from land to land. We occupy ourselves in Divine lore; we study eternal and disregard temporal advantages."

Mr. Hans Van Eichardt, describing the Jews of Russia, says: "The incredible frugality of the Jews checks their progressive tendencies. Their efforts are on a small scale, and concerned with small things, they look for no progress, dreading changes, enlightenment, a more rapid rate of existence, light, air, and struggle. The eastern Jews are not the same everywhere; the type living in White Russia must be regarded as the most impractical, mystical dreamers among the orthodox Jews. So long as they remain undisturbed in their own family life, devoting themselves to piety and the study of the Talmud, they are contented, and their narrow circumstances, the inertia and poverty of the land and its other inhabitants suit them and answer their requirements."

Mr. Wilman, in his *History of the Jews*, thus describes the conditions of Jewry after the fall of Jerusalem: "After the din of arms, the confusion of besieged cities;

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

after the miseries of famine, massacre and conflagration, came the disputes about unclean meats, new moons and the observance of the Sabbath. Gumalil Eliezer, Rabbi Joshua, Rabbi Akiba and their contemporaries were continually disputing about evening prayers, fitness of new born animals wounded in the lips as offerings. Rabbinism became the ruling power among Jewry; the Rabbis became the officiating priesthood and inspired the Jewish people with a reverential and passionate attachment to the Mosaic Law. Ezra and Nehemiah encouraged by all possible means the separation of the Jews from the rest of mankind. By degrees, attachment to the law sank deeper and deeper into the national character; it was not merely at once their Bible and Statute Book, it entered into the most minute detail of common life. Public and private affairs depended on the sanction of the rabbis. It would have been considered as inevitably tending to a great national calamity, if it had been discovered that the New Moon or the Passover had been celebrated on a miscalculated day. Every duty of life, of social intercourse between man and man, of criminal and civil jurisprudence was regulated by an appeal to the Book of the Law. At every meal the conscience shuddered at the possibility of some provision of the law having been violated or overlooked."

The Jewish people were so absorbed in the divine and considered the Torah so binding upon them that the slightest transgression subjected the transgressor to the most cruel punishment. The most effective weapon in the hands of those who constituted themselves the authority in Jewish communal life was excommunication. This power was the worst instrument within the hands of the rabbis, to whom the Jewish people willingly sur-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

rendered as long as the latter adhered to the Mosaic Law. The Jews, "by their great intolerance and their conduct toward all who entertained opinions of the least liberality, differing ever so slightly from their own, brought down upon themselves terrible calamities. Rabbi Solomon of Montpellier, with his colleagues and disciples, resorted to the Flagellants and Dominicans for aid against Maimonides, saying: 'Behold, there are among us heretics and infidels, for they were seduced by Moses Ben Maimon of Egypt. You who clear your community of heretics, clear ours too.' " They assented gladly and the books of Maimonides were burned at the stake in Paris and Montpellier.

From the conduct of these fanatics toward Maimonides, says Michael L. Rodkinson, "we can conceive their terrible vengeance against an ordinary man or scholar who ventured to express opinions in any degree at variance with their own—or to transgress the Sabbath by carrying a handkerchief or drinking of Gentile wine, which in their opinion is against the law. Who, then, could resist their terrible weapon of excommunication, which they used for the purpose of making a man a ravenous wolf whom every human being fled from and shunned as the plague-smitten? Many who drank of their bitter cup were driven to the grave and many others went mad."

The weapon of excommunication was employed by the rabbis of old to keep the Jews in utter submission. It prevented freedom of thought or action and subjected every individual who dared to assume an independent stand on religious matters to untold suffering. It was employed against Jeremiah, who was finally confined in prison. It was used against Spinoza and resulted in his

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

banishment from his native city. Maimonides felt its fangs and after his death the executioners of this power wrote on his grave, "Here lies an excommunicated Jew."

Up to the last fifty or sixty years Heine's description of a Jew was applicable practically to all the Jews. As long as this was true there was no need for a search of a definition of Judaism. The Jews, in the full meaning of the term, were a religious group. Their beliefs, their practices, their outward appearance—since that too was a result of religious belief with them—marked them as a group. Their status was so clearly defined that there could be no confusion. They were devout and earnest in their beliefs and were proud to consider themselves, and to be considered, a religious group. The Jews of old did not mind the burdens that the observance of the Torah entailed and suffered in humility every sort of oppression and persecution. They did not rebel against their oppressors, bearing their burdens patiently in the hope that in due time Messiah would come and lead them out of captivity into the promised land.

The difficulties in classifying Jews today have arisen out of the change in attitude, in thought, and in practice of our modern Jew. The bite of excommunication has lost its sting. The Inquisition is no more. It is no longer considered a sacrilege to investigate religions, Jewish or any other. The rabbis and the priests have lost their grip on human thought and men are free to believe as they please without let or hindrance.

Everything that went to make up the Jewish religion has, during the last seventy-five years, entirely disappeared. The Sabbath is but a memory recalled to the modern Jew by the annual dues he grudgingly pays for the maintenance of a temple, where a scholarly rabbi

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

gathers in the members on Friday night and studiously avoiding any reference to a personal God or the divinity of the Torah, delivers a sermon on "A Strange Interlude" or some other erotic book which has nothing at all to do with the Jewish, or any other religion.

The prohibition against eating the swine has been construed by the individual Jew as some sort of a regulation which Moses considered indispensable in the wilderness through which he had led the Jews from Egypt, and of no force today. As a result of this change of attitude towards the dietetic prohibitions of the Bible, it ceased to be a crime for a Jew to eat at the table of a Gentile and we find our people indiscriminately partaking of bacon, and the lamb is being cooked in its mother's milk. Shylock's declaration, "I will buy with you, I will sell with you, but I will not eat or drink with you," has lost its practical meaning.

Our idea of God, too, has undergone a radical change. No more do we think of him as one who can speak human languages, hear human prayers, reward for observing the statutes and ordinances contained in the Bible, or punish for transgressions. Professor Einstein speaks the mind of the majority of Jews when he says: "I cannot conceive of a God that rewards and punishes;" and the Jews do not protest against Dr. Gerson B. Levi, of Temple Isaiah Israel of Chicago, who says: "There is a steady process which we may call fleeing from religion . . . Any one who has with open eyes read either articles in magazines that presumably cultured people read, or longer treatises in books, will be able to point to the fact that the spirit of the age is one that questions, one that will not bend the knee to that which in the past received willing and unquestioned obedience and adoration . . .

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

When a younger generation flees from religion it claims at the same time that it is doing so in the name of freedom. It would shake off the shackles—religion. It would be untrammelled. It would be free.”

This rabbi and hundreds of others may challenge the claim of Youth that fleeing from religion is fleeing towards freedom, but he and they know that what kept our people in actual mental slavery was religion. How much freedom can a person have whose mental condition is such that he can without qualms say, “Help us, our God, to banish from our hearts all pride and vain glory, all confidence in worldly possessions, all self-sufficient leaning upon our own reason. Fill us with the spirit of meekness and the grace of modesty, that we may become wise in the fear of Thee.”¹⁴ Such attitude of mind is productive of slavery; the change is fleeing from religion towards freedom, and the Jews of today, while repeating the prayer have freed themselves from the bondage it impliedly imposes.

Jews and non-Jews understand that the present intellectual status of the human race is not due to ancient religious beliefs, but to the wisdom of Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Descartes and Spinoza. The present generation accepts the philosophy of Hume, Rousseau and Spencer and prefers reading Hugo, Carlyle, Emerson, and Dostoevsky to the Bible, the New Testament or the Torah.

In less than a hundred years, within the lifetime of a human being, we have shed our beards and ear locks; we have discarded our shtrimel and scull cap, we have walked out of the cocoon of superstition and developed a taste for saxophone in place of the Shofar. Nothing so conspicuously demonstrates the metamorphosis of

¹⁴*Union Prayer Book: 43.*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Jewish religion as do the two illustrations here produced. Dr. Zan D. Klopfer in his "Blowing the Shofar" presents a scene from his childhood days when, with his father, he sat in a synagogue and gazed at the holier of holies sounding the "Tekiho," surrounded by Jews who knew and felt the significance of the function. The other is a reproduction of a photograph that appeared in the *Chicago Daily News* of Sept. 30, 1932, showing the modern rabbi holding the prayer book and standing before the Torah. A youngster is performing the act which for thousands of years had been intrusted only to the most pious member of the congregation. Can it be said that the Judaism of today is the same as was the Judaism of fifty years ago?

Describing the futile effort of a Jewish rabbi to reach Jewish homes over the radio in an article in the *Chicago Israelite* of October 11, 1930, the author says, "The voice of the rabbi wandering thus through the ether met the voice of a Christian minister that had been sent out through a microphone the Sunday before. 'And where are you going?' asked the voice of the Christian. 'I am hunting for Jewish homes, and almost everywhere I am turned away for Jazz. Where are you going?' 'I am hunting for Christian homes but almost everywhere I am driven away.' "

Because of this change of mental attitude the average rabbi deplores the inconsistency between our conduct and our prayers. "If," says a Chicago rabbi, "A total stranger to our way of service and to our books of prayer came to visit American Judaism . . . he might find that people say words which actually they do not endorse, or in which they do not believe. He might light upon paragraphs that long ago, because of a better understanding of the course



Chicago Jewish Chronicle

BLOWING OF THE SHOFAR



Chicago Daily News, Sept 30, 1932

MODERN BLOWING OF THE SHOFAR

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

of history, and a new criticism of the documents of history, should have passed out of the printed page and away from the lips of those who say prayers."

We need not become embarrassed by the disclosure that religiously we have become bankrupt. Our Christian friends are in no better position. Dr. Shailer Mathews, dean of the Divinity School, University of Chicago, knowing that one cannot tell a college man that Jesus was the Son of God and was the result of an Immaculate Conception, speaking of Christianity says, "A religion is not a philosophy. To regard Christianity as a collection of truths is to transform it from a religion to a philosophy. Real Christianity is to be found in the attitudes and loyalties of a continuous group which has gained assurance that through them its members are to have a richer and happier life. . . . The only definition which can include the variations of the Christian movement is that Christianity is the religion of those who call themselves Christians. To attempt to apply the poetic aphorisms of Jesus literally to our modern world is impracticable. . . . If the religious ideas of the early or medieval Christians constitute Christianity, the modern religion of that name is not Christianity."

If we substitute the word Judaism in place of Christianity and Jews in place of Christians the statement will be as appropriate for a rabbi as it is for a Christian theologian. The reason that there is so little difference between the viewpoints of divine and rabbi is not due to an agreement that both religions are alike but to the recognition of the truth that the substance of religion has worn itself out and nothing but empty shells remain. The Reverend Charles Stelzle in the *World's Work* said the church was declining largely because those who are

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

identified with it do not actually believe in it, and Mr. Walter Lippman declared that people lost interest in the church because they were not certain that they could meet God if they went there. If a lot of people still go to church or temple, it is largely because of strenuous drives by pulpit seeking priests and rabbis, and client-seeking lawyers and insurance brokers, and to a large extent they are still being attracted by open forums, basketball and swimming pools, but the spirituality which attracted our forefathers to their synagogues has entirely disappeared.

What Jew of today will disagree with Dr. Jesse H. Holmes, Professor of Philosophy at Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, who says, "Churches are officially established on a foundation of medieval superstitions, in which a large proportion of both ministers and laymen do not actually believe at all. They cannot be reconciled with that basis of modern science which all honest, intelligent thinking people accept." The doctor classes as medieval superstitions such doctrine as the fall of man, original sin, Jonah and the whale, the virgin birth, and other miracle stories taught as essentials by fundamentalist Christianity. Who shall question the proposition that synagogues and temples are officially established on a foundation of medieval superstitions? Who shall deny the statement that rabbis and laymen do not actually believe in these superstitions? Where is there an honest, intelligent, thinking Jew who still believes in Jonah and the whale, the Miraculous Conception of Sarah, the conversation between God, Abraham, and Moses, and the many other miracle stories recited to every congregation by its rabbi at every service?

What Jew will take issue with Rabbi Mitchel Salem

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

Fisher of Congregation Rodeph Sholom, New York, who resigning from his post as rabbi says, "No sincere student of the American Jewish scene can fail to realize the tragedy now eventuating. Preachers enunciate ideals, but these must remain so indefinite so unpointed, so unchallenging, so completely removed from the real issues of every day living and struggling, that these ideals become patently and utterly vain. The rabbi becomes an exalted lecturer, entertainer and institution promotion agent. My colleagues may loudly protest, and will boldly assert . . . that they are free. They may even think so. The fact remains that with very, very few exceptions none of them is the possessor of effective freedom." Let any modern Jew test this frank statement by his own personal experience and observation, and he will find that the rabbi is as correct in his survey of the Jewish temple as is Dr. Holmes in his survey of the conditions prevailing in the Christian churches.

Whether the present Jewish attitude towards the Torah and the Talmud is a correct one is beside the question for the reason that it is a condition, not a theory. It must be admitted that the Jew of today is as far removed from his grandfather's religion as is Professor Einstein from the religion of Maimonides. The latter believed in a God that ruled the whole universe and punished and rewarded as humans deserved, and in the resurrection of the dead; the former declares, "I cannot imagine a God who rewards and punishes—Neither can I believe that the individual survives the death of his body, although feeble souls harbor such thoughts through fear."

Today the Jew, in his feeble effort to establish the claim to being religiously Jewish, resorts to the platitude that Judaism consists in the observance of the Ten Command-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

ments, even though all mankind observes most of these instinctively rather than because they were orders from on high, and we violate them as frequently, when it suits our purpose, as do Christians. "Love thy neighbor as thyself," says the modern Jew, is the Jewish religion, yet one is no more a Jew because he approves this sentiment than one is a Christian because he approves the sentiment; "Do unto others as you would others do unto you." Jews love their neighbor no more than the Gentile loves his, and the Christian observes his doctrine with no greater devotion than Jews observe theirs.

"There is a cult of Jews," says a writer in the *B'nai B'rith* of November, 1930, "that considers religion the least of the Jewish identity. They set Judaism aside as a factor in their lives. They consider themselves Jews only by cultural association, such as fondness of Jewish art. It is good to foster Jewish culture, but the fundamental of Jewish life is Jewish religion, and Jewish education must emphasize Judaism rather than Jewish dilettantism."

"The Torah," says Rabbi Samuel S. Cohon, in the *Jewish Layman* of March, 1930, "has regimented the Jews of all ages and of all countries into a unified people. For the loyal Jews the Talmud represented an actual continuation of the revelation made at Sinai, and unassailable authority. Talmudic Law has served as the foundation of Jewish religious life." "God, as conceived by Israel's men of faith," continues the Rabbi, "is not only the first cause, the Creative Power and the World Reason, but also the living and loving Father of Men. He is my God, my living God, to him I flee when tried in grief, my banner high, my refuge strong, who hears and answers when I call. He is the Eye that sees, the Ear

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

that hears, the Heart that feels, the Conscience that judges, the Will that determines and executes. Religion grows into power when God is felt as an ever present reality in our lives." With the recognition of this sort of a God there is Jewish religion, but the same Rabbi in the *Jewish Layman* of January, 1931, admits that "The modern temper has affected a revaluation of the character of the Torah. Its supernatural claims cannot be maintained in the light of modern scholarship. . . . Reform Judaism frankly disregards many of the provisions and viewpoints of the Torah as no longer tenable. Its ceremonies and civil laws are for the most part honored in the breach rather than in the practice by conservative Jews and even by large numbers of Jews who class themselves as Orthodox."

From the moment the Jew arrives at the point when God ceases to be the "living and loving Father of men;" when he abandons the belief that "God can hear and answer him," his religion is no longer Jewish. Any Rabbi or Layman who attempts to define Jewish religion minus a living and loving God, finds himself in the same difficulties as a Catholic would be if he attempted to define Catholic religion minus the Trinity and the Pope. As a practical proposition, the religion of the average Jew of this day is anything but Jewish no matter how we may quibble about the subject. No two rabbis, nor any two Jews will unqualifiedly agree on what is Jewish religion as easily as do men of other faiths, unless they accept the phrase "way of life" as religion, but that would not be Jewish religion.

The *Jewish Layman* of May 22, 1931, deplors the fact that "because we can do what we wish, because we are allowed to go to our own house of worship—we don't.

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

. . . In this age of tolerance when you and I have finally won freedom to think and act and worship as we please—when we no longer have to go to temple every day or every week—we don't go at all. . . . We should go regularly to preserve our Jewish consciousness—to help maintain our pride in our glorious heritage—to renew old friendships and form new friends among our own people.” What sort of a religion is this which consists entirely in maintaining pride in heritage and is calculated to help a worshiper at temple to make new friendships? Where is God's part in our religion and in what manner shall we worship him? Can any group of people long maintain a temple avowedly dedicated to God which in reality is employed to promote and encourage pride in heritage?

The Jew of today is preserving his heritage like the Puritan of this age. “People of good New England stock” says Mr. Samuel Eliot Morrison, “have a strong complex about Puritanism, which upon analysis is found to be derived from a sour old grandfather who made the Sabbath hideous with stuffy devotions, or a tight-lipped maiden aunt who gave up for lost anyone who preferred the brush or the fiddle-bow to the pen or the hammer. Every age will conceive the past in its own terms. . . . Around 1800 the general school book idea of the New England Puritans was that they were rebels against England. Toward 1830 they became heralds of democracy. . . . In another generation they became, for the North, prophets of humanity and union. . . . while for the South they were the people ultimately responsible for abolition, hatred and radical cant. The Puritans were, broadly speaking, the Englishmen who had accepted the Reformation without the Renaissance. . . . There was

ARE THE JEWS A RELIGIOUS GROUP?

no class struggle complex in their minds; their common band was religion and their point of view, in most matters, was distinctly medieval. . . . they hoped to establish in the New World a City of God—Just such a Christian civilization as existed in the mind of St. Augustine and other medieval dreamers. . . . They believed that man was created for the glory of God, and that the unique duty and purpose of man was to serve God and do His will.”

We of today also conceive the past of Jewry in our own terms. We clothe our ancestors with the halo of freedom-lovers and tyranny-haters; in truth they were just ordinary, medieval, superstitious, narrow-minded believers in the doctrine that God created Jews for His Glory and that it was the business of Jews to serve God and do his will. Let us place ourselves in the age of our grandfathers and view the Jews of today; what a glorious change we shall observe. Indeed if the religion of our fathers was Judaism, ours certainly is not.

Mr. Morris Raphael Cohen, Professor of Philosophy at the City College, New York, speaking of religion, says: “I confess that I have never been able to understand any theism that was not anthropomorphic; and I have not since my thirteenth year seen any logical force in the theistic argument that the entire universe must have a person as its cause, designer or director. . . . I believe that the forces which control all things are ultimately many; and if I could use the term polytheism, without implying that these forces are exclusively personal, I should call myself a polytheist.” In his essay, “What I Believe” (*The Nation*, Aug. 5, 1931) he says: “So long as we lack omniscience and omnipotence, life will necessarily contain a tragic element. Death will continue to rob us of

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

those we dearly love, and unforeseen circumstances will frustrate our most cherished plans. But we cannot overcome this by wilful illusions, any more than the ostrich can escape the hunter by burying his head in the sand. . . . The safer way to peace and serenity is through the cultivation of intelligent courage and wise resignation. We need courage to look into our own heart and clear it of foolish desires which make us sow vain hopes and devote needless toil and anxiety to raise bitter crops of disappointment. And we need resignation to live in a world that is not formed just for our comfort."

If we could rid ourselves of the usual resistance which we exhibit against any attempt to analyze the reality of Jewishness, we should have no difficulty in understanding that there can be no Jewish religion without the belief in "the existence of a God with a claim to our adoration; in the prophetic inspiration of chosen men; in the divinity and unalterability of the Torah; in God's providence; in His just rewards and punishments; in the future appearance of the Messiah and the resurrection of the dead."

CHAPTER V

THE RACE MYTH

TO THE Jew who still believes in Jehovah and follows the laws of Moses, the reality of the racial idea is of no importance. He verily can say, "What matters it if your skin is black, white, yellow, or brown, if you have abandoned the Lord and do not observe the Torah? On the other hand, if you believe in God and observe all His statutes and all His ordinances, the color of your skin, the shape of your nose, the manner of your speech, or your particular likes and dislikes are of no consequence."

But to us of today who have traveled the whole length of modern thought, the racial question becomes one of the most absorbing elements in Jewry. Our modern rabbis do not preach on the reality of God or the divinity of His Torah. The Torah, they tell us, is only of historic importance and deserves our attention in order that we may know what the Jewish people have been in the past; but what we must maintain and preserve forever is the Unity of Israel, based on the recognition of the racial reality of the Jewish people. Even Einstein, who at one time stated that race is a humbug, speaking of the Jewish Homeland, declares that one of the most deadly foes of the Jewish Nationalism is the lack of racial consciousness. Evidently such a great intellect as Einstein's can conceive the idea that the assertion on the part of any group of people that they are of a certain specific race is a humbug, and entertain the notion that lack of racial consciousness on the part of the Jews is a fault rather than a virtue.

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

The first question which presents itself is, can several groups of people scattered all over the face of the earth be said to be a specific race? If answered in the affirmative, the next question is, what are the special elements or characteristics which can or may be taken into consideration as being the particular attributes of the groups so designated as a race?

In the investigation of this racial question, we are not concerned with the results of scientific research in the department of anthropology, for the reason that in our quest for the realities, we are not actuated by a desire to effect the separation of races but by the anxiety to understand the interrelations of human beings and the conditions under which a social structure could be maintained, with every one enjoying the largest measure of liberty and equality.

We must, in our consideration of Jewish raciality, remember that scientific determination of racial status inevitably leads to the separation of humanity into conflicting groups while philosophically we can arrive at the recognition of the doctrine that all men are created equal, which necessarily leads to the ignoring of racial distinctions between Man and Man. If, in the effort to form the American democracy, the founders had submitted the racial questions to scientific tests, mankind would still be debating about the diversity of races and the rights of minority groups which constituted the people who occupied the British Colonies in America. By ignoring the questions of racial differences "our fathers" were enabled to establish the United States of America. Scientifically the Negroes are a distinct race, but by rejecting the outward color and accepting the principle that all men are created equal, we were able to include a provision

THE RACE MYTH

in the American Constitution that every man is endowed with the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness without regard to his race, color, religion, or previous condition of servitude. This legalistically recognized principle should be accepted as applicable to Jews as well as to Nordics, Teutons or Negroes. Sociallogically considered the difference in races becomes unimportant and the emphasis of racial differences leads to prejudice, and often to oppression.

Dr. S. M. Melamed, in an article in the September, 1929, *Reflex*, speaking of the Arabians, says, "We Westerners speak of the Arabians as of a nation or a race or religion. The Arabians are neither. The thirty-five million Arabians are divided into forty-two different religions and into a maddening mixture of races. Arabia is an inflammable medley of races and religions. There are Mohammedan and Christian Arabs; there are Shiite and Sunite Arabs, and there are Parsee, Murdish, Druse and Wahabi Arabs. There are also pagan Arabs. Arabia is not a country, not a race, not a religion, not a nationality." Dr. Melamed is a well known scholar; an active man in the Zionist movement. He cannot be brushed aside as no authority merely for the reason that his opinion does not coincide with the theory of Jewry. He still is one of the articulate Jews and his opinion is at least of as much value as is the opinion of any other Jew.

Scientifically the author is wrong when he says that thirty millions of men and women occupying a certain territory, living under the same climatic conditions, whose ancestors had occupied the same soil for centuries, are not a race, not a religion, and not a nationality; and he is just as wrong when he asserts that sixteen million Jews living in different countries, under different climatic con-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

ditions, speaking different languages, entertaining different religious beliefs, and unable to trace their ancestry to any one common territory, are a specific race. Re-word the statement of Melamed by substituting the word Jew for Arab, and the result cannot possibly be different.

Graetz, speaking of the Jews in Arabia, says: "The Arabs were in intimate intercourse with the Jews. . . . Many Arabs embraced this religion. As they had practiced circumcision while heathens, their conversion to Judaism was particularly easy. When a chieftain became a Jew his whole clan at once followed him into the fold of Judaism. Several Arabian tribes were thus converted. Kings and princes with all their following became Jews in this fashion, until there was actually a Jewish kingdom established consisting of Arabs." There must be thousands of Arabs who are as much Jewish as is Dr. Melamed. Some of the descendants of these Arabs may even now be our next door neighbors, or members of some of our exclusive Jewish clubs.

Mr. Edward Augustus Freeman, one of the most distinguished English historians, speaking of race, says, "We know nothing of the origin of society. It may be that the groups that came together and formed the primeval society, which spoke the primeval Aryan tongue, were not brought together by community of bloods. There is no theory of the origin of man which requires us to believe that the primeval Aryans were a natural family; they may have been more like an accidental party of fellow travelers. And if we accept them as a natural family, it does not follow that the various branches which grew into separate races and nations were necessarily marked off by more immediate kindred. It may be that there is no nearer kindred in blood between this or that Persian,

THE RACE MYTH

this or that Greek, this or that Teuton, (and he might have said this or that Jew) than the general kindred of all Aryans. When this or that party marched off from the common home, it does not follow that those who marched off together were necessarily immediate brothers or cousins. The party which grew into Hindus or Teutons may not have been made up exclusively of one set of near-kinsfolk. Some of the children of the same parents or forefathers may have marched one way while others marched another."

"It may be that the Gothic Amali and the Roman Aamiliii were branches of a family which had taken a name before the division of Teuton and Italian. Our whole conception of race starts from the idea of community of blood. If the word 'race' does not mean community of blood it is hard to see what it does mean, yet it is certain that there can be no positive proof of real community of blood even among those groups of mankind which we instinctively speak of as families and races. It is not merely that the blood has been mingled in aftertime; there is no positive proof that there was any community of blood in the beginning.

"No living Englishman can prove with absolute certainty that he comes in the line of any Teuton who settled in Britain in the fifth or sixth centuries. We may be sure that in no other case can such a pedigree be proved by the kind of proof which lawyers would require to make out the title to an estate or peerage. The actual forefathers of the modern Englishman may chance to have been not true born Angles or Saxons, but Britains, Scots, in later days Frenchmen, Flemings, men of any other nation who learned to speak English and took themselves English names." (*Historical Essays*; 1879.)

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

What is true of the Englishman must also be true of the Jew who happens to be an Englishman; the latter can produce no proof that his ancestor was not one of those Angles, Scots, or Teutons who came upon what is now known as English soil, and there accepted the Jewish faith and thus founded a Jewish family. Nor can he prove that he is a descendant of a Jew who lived in Palestine 2,000 years ago.

Mr. Ralph Waldo Emerson, after describing the special characteristics of the English people, in his *Essays on English Traits*, says, "Whilst race works immortally to keep its own, it is resisted by other traits. The Arabs of today are the Arabs of Pharaoh; but the Briton of today is a very different person from the Cassibelaunus or Ossian. Trades and professions carve their own lines on face and form. . . . Though we flatter the self-love of men and nations by the legend of pure races, all of our experience is of the graduation and resolution of races, and strange resemblances meet us everywhere. It need not puzzle us that Malay and Papuan, Celt and Roman, Saxon and Teuton should mix, when we see the rudiments of tiger and baboon in our human form, and know that the variety of races are not so firm but that some spray sprinkles us from the antediluvian seas."

"The English composite character betrays a mixed origin. The language is mixed, the names of men are of different nations; the currents of thought are counter; contemplation and practical skill; active intellect and dead conservatism; world wide enterprise, and devoted use and want; aggressive freedom and hospitable law, with bitter class legislation; . . . nothing can be praised in it without damning exceptions, and nothing denounced without salvos of cordial praise. Who can call by right names what

THE RACE MYTH

racess are in Britain? Who can trace them historically? Who can discriminate them anatomically or metaphysically?"

When you analyze the Jewish people in the light of the foregoing, you must find that their language is mixed, the names of men are of different nations; the currents of thought are counter; Zionist and anti-Zionist, Orthodox, Reform and Atheist. Successful businessmen and racketeers; democrats, republicans and communists; royalists and rebels; nothing can be praised in it without damning exceptions, and nothing denounced without salvos of cordial praise. Who can call by right name what races are in Jewry? Our people have no difficulty in arriving at the same conclusion that Mr. Emerson did, when their investigations concern the racial claims of other peoples—but when speaking of Jews we invariably are heard to say, "If there is any pure race at all we certainly are it."

In a so-called "25th Anniversary Sermon," delivered by Dr. Stephen S. Wise, of the Free Synagogue of New York, he says: "In passing, one may briefly advert upon a most tragic consequence of the blunder of the Jewish Reform Movement in its second and third generation. The denial of the truth of the racial reality of the Jew—which Hirsch suggestively, though awkwardly, styled, 'the peoplehood of Israel'." Dr. Wise is a rabbi engaged ostensibly in guiding his people in the ways of the Lord, but he considers the denial of the racial reality of the Jewish people as a most tragic blunder.

Mr. Louis Browne, the author of *Stranger than Fiction*, in an article in the *American Magazine* for January, 1929, entitled "Why Are Jews Like That?", attempts to prove that we are a race because we display cer-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

tain characteristics not present in the rest of the human race. He tells of a Gentile friend and himself trying to make their way to the Pennsylvania depot. They found the going difficult for it was the lunch hour, and all the thousands of New York's cloak and suit workers were out on the street. "They were ill clad and noisy, and showed little disposition to get out of anybody's way. They stood on the pavement in large coagulated masses shouting to each other in strident argument and gesticulating with vehemence. Many shouted in Yiddish and almost all the rest used an English quite obviously Yiddish in intonation." His friend, who was very hot and angry from long shoving through the horde, turned to Mr. Browne and demanded, "Why are Jews like that?" A day or two later the Gentile made the polite explanation that what he meant by the question had reference to a "queer light in their eyes and a sort of tenseness in their bodies."

And so, Mr. Browne concluded, we are a peculiar people having certain common characteristics transmissible by inheritance and manifested by a "queer light in the eye and a certain tenseness of the body"; therefore, we are a specific race. The trouble with Mr. Browne, however, is that he built his theory upon an explanation rather than upon a fact. His Gentile friend never asked him before why he is like that because there was nothing to provoke the inquiry; what finally did provoke it, was that the hundreds of cloak and suit workers were unreasonably oblivious to the fact that two gentlemen were trying to make their way through the crowd and their going was made difficult, not by the queer light in the eyes or tenseness in the bodies of the cloak and suit workers, but by their "standing on the pavement in large coagulated masses" and shoving the passers-by until

THE RACE MYTH

they became "hot and angry."

The things that made the Gentile ask the question were the conduct and action typical of the average foreigner who has neglected, or has had no opportunity, to acquire the culture of the present day; and Browne's answer should have been, "These are not Jews, they are just cloak and suit workers who came here from every part of Europe where they had no opportunity to learn any manners at all. You wait and see the kind of Americans their children will turn out to be."

There are many people who think that there is something about a person classified as a Jew that is particularly Jewish. They all admit that it is something subtle, intangible and indefinable, but still "There is that something which cannot be ignored." While it is true that a group of Jewish people in a Jewish ghetto in Berlin, London, New York or Chicago, have certain characteristics which are common to them all, it is also true that any one of them placed amidst a membership of a Reform Temple in any of these cities, would look as out of place and unlike the others as a Negro would among a group of Italians. The things which are generally taken to be Jewish characteristics are largely mythical and exist only because of preconceived impressions or notions.

Carl G. Jung, a Swiss psychologist, and a former co-worker of Dr. Sigmund Freud, visited the United States for the first time in 1909. He was walking through the streets of Buffalo and saw hundreds of workmen leaving a factory. "I really had no idea there was such an amazing amount of Indian blood in your people," he remarked to his American companion. "What!" said the American, "Indian blood? I bet there is not one drop of it in this whole crowd." "But don't you see their faces? They are

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

more Indian than European." He was then informed that these workmen were of Irish, Scotch, and German extraction. This psychologist came to America with his preconceived idea that Indian blood courses through the veins of every American just as some people think that Jewish blood courses through the veins of every Jew. As a result of this preconceived notion the psychologist saw Indian characteristics in the faces of the workmen in Buffalo, and it is because of such false preconceived impressions that people think they see something Jewish in men who in reality are Germans, Russians, or Irish.

There is less definite basis for the contention that the Jews are a race than there is for people who claim to be Nordics or Teutons. Historically the Jews are the only people who cannot trace their ancestry to any common source whatever. Even without giving any consideration to non-Jewish thinkers upon the subject of racial identity, we can gather from our own unprejudiced sources enough light to lead us out of the darkness.

Maurice H. Harris, author of *Modern Jewish History*, tells us that "In what is now Russia, Jews had been settled since the beginning of the Christian era; here were settled half-civilized groups of many allied races among them Scythians, Finns, Bulgarians and Chazars. The Chazars had established themselves by the Seventh Century between the Black and Caspian Seas. The steady advance of their conquering armies brought terror to the Persians in Asia and won an alliance with the Byzantine Empire in Europe. The religion of the Chazars had been a strange mixture of idolatrous notions and superstitions, but they eventually embraced Judaism, first the king, then the nobles, and finally the people at large. The next king, Obediah, invited Jews to his kingdom,

THE RACE MYTH

established synagogues and schools, and the people were instructed in the Bible, Talmud and in Jewish observances. In the year 960 the king was called Joseph and the community prospered until about the middle of the eleventh century, and, like the Jewish kingdom established by Jossuf in Arabia in the sixth century, this kingdom was dispersed about the year 1100 . . . but who shall say how far the Jewish influence may have been carried among the scattered people?"

Raisin, in *Haskalah Movement* says, "In 1425, at Kiev, the priest Dionis, the archbishop Aleksey, and through the latter many more clergymen of Novgorod, Moscow and Pskov accepted Judaism and became devout Jews. Aleksey called himself Abraham and his wife Sarah. Grand Duke Ivan Vassilyewiche's daughter-in-law, his secretary, the archimandrite Sasonia, the monk Zacharias, and many other persons of note entered the fold of Judaism." Who can tell where the descendants of the Russians who accepted Judaism are today? The probability is almost a certainty, in the absence of positive proof to the contrary, that Russian Jews are descendants of Russians who accepted Judaism as a religion.

The foregoing is true not only of Russia, but we find a similar situation in Germany. Graetz tells us that "the Jews of Germany are to be regarded merely as colonies of the Frankish Jews, and such of them as lived in Austria shared the same faith as their brethren in France. According to a chronicle the most ancient Jews in the Rhine district are said to have been descendants of the legionaries who took part in the destruction of the temple. From the vast horde of Jewish prisoners, the Vagioni had chosen the most beautiful women, and brought them back to their stations on the shores of the Rhine and the

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Main, and had compelled them to minister to the satisfaction of their desires. The children thus begotten of Jewish and Germanic parents were brought up by their mothers in the Jewish faith, the fathers not troubling themselves about them. It is these children who are said to have been the founders of the first Jewish communities between Worms and Mayence."

While some German Jews may have hooked noses, dark complexion, or curly hair, it does not necessarily follow from these facts that the German Jews belong to a Jewish race. The so-called German Jew, either in Germany or in America, who cannot trace his ancestry beyond the Rhine, is not a member of the Jewish race, but is probably a Frank. Even the nose, ever considered a badge of Jewishness, is no longer competent evidence on the subject. Sir Arthur Keith and Professor Elliot Smith, famous British scientists, earnestly disputed about how long the Roman nose had been Roman, and who lived in Palestine 6000 years ago. Professor Smith contended that the people who lived in Palestine were "Natufians." They showed definite Negroid characteristics of flat noses and thick lips. Sir Arthur claimed that the nose now characteristic of the Semitic people "is quite a recent thing—one of the most recent things in evolution." One cannot assume that the white Jew with the flat nose and thick lip is a development of a Palestinian Negroid, nor can one assume that the Jew with a characteristically Jewish Nose is a descendant of the Caesars.

Speaking of Jews in Spain, Graetz is unable to trace them back to Jerusalem or Judea, and he limits himself to the statement that, "The first settlement of Jews in beautiful Hesperia is buried in dim obscurity." The historian would have found no difficulty on the subject if he

THE RACE MYTH

had inferred that these Jews were natives of Hesperia who accepted Judaism just as other natives accepted Christianity; from which inference it would have followed that the Hesperian Jews had no claim to membership in the Jewish race. "Pride of ancestry," says Graetz, "which was the characteristic of the Jews of Spain, was not content with the fact that the Jews possessed the right of citizenship, but desired to lay claims to high antiquity for it, so they maintained that they had been transported hither, after the destruction of the Temple, by the Babylonian conqueror Nebuchadnezzar. They even boasted descent from the royal house of David." A careful study of the motive of the Spanish Jews, when considered in the light of the entire claims of the Jews of old, shows why many people located in different parts of the world accepted Judaism; it was the anxiety to be members of a group chosen by the Lord as his one and only concern.

Wells, in his *Outline of History*, says, "From such hidden and forgotten records as they had with them (in Babylonia), genealogies, contemporary histories of David, Solomon and their other kings, legends and traditions, they made out and amplified their own story, and told it to Babylon and themselves. The Story of the Creation, The Flood, much of the story of Moses, much of Samson, were probably incorporated from Babylonian sources. When the Jews returned from Babylon only the *Pentateuch* had been put together into one book. . . . Over all the literature of the Jews were thrown certain leading ideas. There was an idea, which even these books themselves gainsay in detail, that all the people were pure-blooded children of Abraham; there was next an idea of a promise made by Jehovah to Abraham that he would exalt

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

the Jewish race above all other races; and thirdly, there was the belief that Jehovah was the only true God. The Jews became convinced at last, as a people, that they were the chosen people of the one God of all the earth.

"This idea of belonging to a chosen race predestined to pre-eminence was a very attractive one. It possessed also those Jews who remained in Babylonia. Its literature reached the Jews now established in Egypt. It affected the mixed peoples who had been placed in Samaria when the ten tribes were deported to Media. It inspired a great number of Babylonians and the like to claim Abraham as their father and thrust their company upon the returning Jews. Amorites and Moabites became adherents. The Jews were already a people dispersed in many lands and cities when their minds and hopes were unified and they became an exclusive people.

"To Phoenicians, after the falls of Tyre and Carthage, conversion to Judaism must have been particularly easy and attractive. Their language was closely akin to Hebrew. It is possible that the great majority of African and Spanish Jews are really of Phoenician origin. There were also great Arabian accessions. In South Russia there were even Mongolian Jews."

Renan, speaking of the racial pretensions of the Jews, says, "One would imagine that a Jew in 1800 is a descendant of a Jew in David's time; that the entire genealogy of a Jewish family, whether the starting point be Paris, London, Vienna, or Warsaw, would, if traced back far enough lead us to some village in Palestine after having made the circuit of the world. This is not true. While we do not know just what happened in prehistoric times we know that as far back as the eighth century before the Christian era, prophets arose and proclaimed a new

THE RACE MYTH

doctrine, a unique God to the world, and a law of justice for all men. They created a universal religion without analogy up to that time, and whose dogmas and orders could and must find an echo in every human heart whatever the blood that courses through it might be. The disdain for sacrifices and cults, for vain forms and lifeless images; the direct communion of men with God in reason and right, the communion of man in justice and charity, an ideal resplendent with terrestrial happiness that awaited humanity at the end of its career; all these strange novelties, still new today, despite all our philosophy, burst for the first time upon the world in lightening words of the prophets. From that day religion became separated from race; from that day, too, there began a new order of phenomena that had never as yet been produced, the phenomena of conversion. A large part of the Greek population of Antioch was converted to Judaism. The Jewish colony of Alexandria, the largest of its kind, was essentially of Hellenic blood. The result is that from this time the word Judaism possessed no special ethnographical significance."

Max Radin says, "The Jews are spoken of as a part of the Semitic race. If we mean by that a people speaking a Semitic language, the statement is literally true, and that is the only significance modern anthropologists will permit us to give to the phrase 'Semitic race.' If we mean, by calling them Semites, to assert that they have exactly the same physical inheritance as the Mesopotamians, the Syrians, or the Arabs of their day, the statement is manifestly untrue. The Jews in Palestine were to a considerable extent physically the kindred of the Canaanites, and those, in the main, have resided in the country long before the Semitic speaking tribe filtered

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

in from the desert. And many generations before the Bible reached its present form, men of widely varying physical origin had in one way or another become amalgamated with the Canaanite Jews.

"If we could conjecture by what name they (the Hebrews and Jews) would have liked to be called, it probably would have been 'the people of the Lord.' They thought the bond that united them and distinguished them from others to be a religious bond and not one of blood. Kenite and Hittite might be a believer and thus a member of the community, however remote his blood affiliation was; but Amelikite and Moabite, undoubted brethren in blood, were not members."

If we are Semites at all, it must be, according to this author, not because of blood, but because of language. Are we, then, Jews because of a common language? Surely not, because we have no language, excepting possibly Hebrew, and that is only employed in the prayers of the Orthodox and involves purely religion. The Catholic is not a Latin because Latin is the language of the Catholic Church and even though all Catholics everywhere use that language in their religious services they are not, by that usage, members of the same race. The creed, not the language used in expressing it, is what unites the Catholics; and it is the religion, not the Hebrew language, that always has been the foundation of Jewish union. Divested of our religious beliefs, we cease to be "the people of the Lord" and hence, cease to be members of the same group.

The racial division of mankind, except between the white, black, brown and yellow races, is so indefinable that it is absurd to say that this or that man belongs to this or that race. The matter easily proves itself when one

THE RACE MYTH

attempts to place any known person within the bonds of any race. To what race did Napoleon belong? Where can we place Goethe, Milton, Darwin, Edison, Orville Wright, Hudson, Madame Curie, Vereschagin, and Dostoyevsky? It is very simple to assign to every one of these a place in a nation but not in a race.

It is the nation, rather than the race, that is responsible for the great men that come from it. It is the nation's economic conditions, the liberty its citizens enjoy, the equality they are accorded before the law, the educational facilities the nation maintains, that make up the garden within which the flower of genius buds and develops. It was the German nation, rather than any given race, that produced a Goethe, a Schiller, and a Heine. It was the American nation, not any race, that produced a Lincoln, an Emerson, and an Edison. It was the English nation that produced a Darwin, a Huxley, and a Spencer. The Goethes, and the Schillers, and the Mozarts, all bear the label *Made in Germany*, and it is utter nonsense to say that Heine does not bear the same label because his parents believed in the Torah rather than in the New Testament.

The racial idea, besides being false and without foundation, is also obnoxious to the present-day conceptions of society. It borders upon the old Massachusetts idea that "in the land of the cod the Lodges speak only to Cabots and the Cabots speak only to God." It pre-supposes some kind of superiority based upon a presumption of difference in blood. How can we claim to be Jews because of race and expect to be taken at our word, without being ready to assume the consequences that are bound to follow? If, by virtue of our racial claim, we are better and superior than others, so that we do not

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

want our daughters to marry men of another group, have we any right to demand equal rights at the hands of those others who constitute the overwhelming majority of the people? To be entitled to equality one must wash his hands clean of racial claims and stand as an equal with all mankind, reserving unto himself, as an individual, the same rights to practice his religious beliefs that he grants to others.

A most absurd argument that we often hear in support of so-called racial distinction and superiority is the achievement of some Jews. We flaunt Spinoza in the face of our neighbors and say, "Look what the Jewish race gave to the world." How many Jews have read Spinoza? On the other hand, how many have not read Shakespeare, Defoe, Tolstoy, Hugo, Emerson, Darwin, and hundreds of other non-Jewish writers? Our lives, indeed, would be rather prosaic if it were not for the wealth of literature produced by men from every part of the world. But we say, "In proportion to our numbers the Jewish race has produced a greater number of great men." Have "we"? Is it not a fact that the same influences and environment produced a Lord Reading and a Lloyd George? They both drank at the great well of human knowledge created long before either of them was born. They were educated in the schools established by the British government where each of them was born and lived. Disraeli and Gladstone were both Englishmen, born in the same country, educated in the same schools, reared under the same form of government; there was nothing about the statesmanship of Disraeli that was particularly Jewish any more than there was anything Christian in the statesmanship of Gladstone.

The achievement of any individual in any line of en-

THE RACE MYTH

deavor does not prove any of the particular proclivities of the race from which that individual happens to spring. There are the same heroes and villains in every race. The penal institutions, like the colleges and great industrial and financial organizations, contain members of every race and followers of every religious creed. The Dutch did not produce a Roosevelt any more than the Negroes produced a Booker T. Washington. Mascagni was an Italian; so is Al Capone. Abraham Lincoln was of English descent, so was Booth; Theodor Herzl was a Jew; so were "Lefty Louie and Gyp the Blood." America produced a Patrick Henry and a Benedict Arnold. No particular race can claim superiority because of its famous members any more than it can be charged with inferiority because of infamous members thereof.

Germany before the war considered itself the greatest race on earth; and "while most nations are proud of their great men, Germany was proud of itself rather, for producing Luther. It finds him as a German product quite natural—nay, inevitable. A belief in the universal character of his genius thus naturally is converted into a belief of the essentially universal quality of the people who produced him."¹ The Jews have been laboring under the same error; instead of being proud of an Einstein they are proud of the Jewish race, as if it were the essentially universal quality of that race to produce an Einstein.

Says Mr. George A. Dorsey in his *Nature of Man*: "No so-called mental, moral, or intellectual trait, character, disposition, talent, bias, bent, taste, or genius has ever been proved to be innately associated with any race or physical type or with any specific color of skin, hair, or

¹John Dewey: *German Philosophy and Politics*.

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

eyes; or shape of head, face, eyes, nose, chin or ears; with any physical trait whatsoever. Every character and every genius in history—Buddha, Elizabeth, Napoleon, Lincoln, Phidias, da Vinci, Newton, Darwin—apart from time and place, apart from physical and social environment, is incomprehensible.”

The assumption of a superior attitude on account of race culture or past history is a shield behind which the individual hides his ignorance, and has ever been considered contemptible and unbecoming. Race consciousness necessarily involves conceit, pride, and arrogance. If rabbis and Kleagles can approve of these elements in human nature they may preach race consciousness. If, however, conceit and arrogance are vicious characteristics we had better quit talking about the Jewish race. This should not be overlooked either; an individual may develop conceit and arrogance, based upon what he considered his achievement, with some justification, but when one becomes arrogant on account of “race” he finds pride in what others had achieved rather than in his own accomplishment. It is thus that the lowest type Jew can point with pride at Lord Beaconsfield, Baron Hirsch and Judge Brandeis.

If we should accept the proposition advanced by professional Jews, and concurred in by no less professional Christians, that we are a race because of a common background, then we must admit that any group of people who can point to a common history, common traditions, a common culture and a common background, also constitute a race. It would be entertaining, if not instructive, for the reader to attempt to select a group of people, except the Jews, or Gypsies, who can be presented as a race on the basis of common history, etc.

THE RACE MYTH

It might be asked why mankind has, for so long a time, and without a question, considered the Jews as a race, and the answer is that the racial attributes being largely exterior, men's opinions were formed from outward appearances. Take any Gypsy and dress him up in modern clothes and you would not think that he belongs to the Gypsy race. The same is true of an Indian or an Arab. If Vice President Curtis were to dress up in an Indian costume and assume the attitude of an Indian, he would very readily pass for an Indian chief, while, as it is, he is just an American citizen of Indian descent, but not an Indian.

So it has been with the Jewish people from time immemorial. In every part of the world, at all times, the Jew looked as if he were no part of the common population. In Russia, in Germany, in Spain, in Portugal, or in Italy, he wore his hair in a certain fashion, with ringlets hanging down his temples, his beard unshorn, a long "capota," and even his headgear was distinctive. This was not a matter of fashion or mode, but the result of observing the commands contained in the Bible and the Talmud, and if he chose to remain a member of the Jewish community he had no alternative.

"Ye shall not round the corners of your heads, neither shall ye mar the corners of your beard and ye shall not walk in the customs of the nation which I am casting out before you, and ye shall observe all My statutes and all My ordinances and do them." This Biblical direction was not the edict of a police officer, the enactment of a law by a legislature, nor was it a decree issued by a king or a bull promulgated by a pope. It was believed to be the command of God, given to Moses to be transmitted to the children of Israel, and no one was thought to

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

possess the power to change it except one possessed of equal authority. This certainly was the way the commandment was considered by our forefathers, and they implicitly obeyed it. The strict observance of this particular law resulted in the maintenance by the Jewish people of a distinct exterior appearance, thus creating the impression of distinct racial identity. The status of the Jew in Russia is particularly illustrative of this point. Part of the prevalent Russian apparel, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, was a blouse, held by a girdle or belt, worn over the trousers. A person so attired was unmistakably a native Russian. His appearance had no significance as to his religious opinions. The Jews, however, in the same period, wore long trousers covering their boots and long "Caftans," or coats almost to their ankles, with their beards unshorn and the ringlets hanging down along their temples. This outward appearance, while in strict conformity to the Mosaic laws and Jewish customs, indicated that the person was a Jew religiously, and racially not a Russian: therefore, a stranger in the land, living his life according to laws and customs of his own.

It was this Jewish racial attitude that caused the Germans to declare: "*Was der Jude glaubt ist einerlei, in der Rasse liegt die Schweinerei.*" It is not any particular *Schweinerei* in the Jewish race that the German is talking about; what the sentence means, is that it is *Schweinerei* for any group of people to assert racial superiority. Of course, Germany is permeated with a superiority complex, but only as a nation, not as a race. As a superior nation Germany does not exclude any German on account of religious opinion or racial antecedents, but it justly proposes to exclude the Jew if he, although a German,

THE RACE MYTH

persists in flaunting in the face of every other German his racial superiority. The Hitlerites do not claim to be Christians or Gentiles and they do not expect the Jew to become religiously any thing else than he in reality is, but they want him to keep his alleged racial distinction out of the German national structure. It has been reported by Jews that the first family to suffer at the hands of the Hitlerite hooligans in the pogrom in 1931 was one who for the third generation has been religiously Christian but racially Jewish.

The Jews in view of this occurrence conclude that there is nothing left for them to do in any country but to organize and stand together to meet such attacks upon them. What they ought to do to avoid them is to eradicate completely the element of race from religion. Stripped of their exterior, the Jews, like the entire white race, are not of one type and no two members of that alleged race look at all alike. If you view a gathering of men and women in Paris, London, Chicago, or New York, composed of Jews and Gentiles, in the absence of Jewish dress and whiskers, they all look alike. There will be red heads, and men with black or blond hair; there will be tall ones and short ones, lean ones and fat ones, some with Roman noses and some with pug noses, some with high cheek bones and some with hardly noticeable ones. The only common factors to be found in any such lot are that the men and women are white and are members of the human race; nothing more and nothing less. They will all be moved by the same sentiments, will applaud the same speakers and will run for the same exit in case of fire or stampede. In general, they present the effect of cosmopolitanism in training and culture with all distinguishing racial characteristics completely erased.

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

The most conclusive proof that Jews do not come from a common stock, and cannot be taken as a race, is the fact that no other group of people present such diversity of types as any given group of Jews stripped of whiskers and Jewish garb, largely because they come from the stock which the country of their abode contains. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, reporting a World Jewish Conference held at Geneva in 1932, says that the world, which, without troubling to draw distinctions, assumes that "A Jew is a Jew," would have been amazed to note how sharply the delegates were divided from one another in appearance, attire, speech—the outward signs of a dispersion. "Beyond that," he says, "there are the deepest seated differences of viewpoint which are bound up with general conditions and particularly Jewish circumstances in various lands. The tendencies making for disagreement and division were many. The impulses urging toward unity were comparatively few . . . Jews are in no sense one or united in faith. As many Jews, so many faiths and unfaiths. They are not fellow religionists." If the rabbi had visited a world disarmament congress at Geneva, attended by delegates from all nations, he could have noted that these delegates were also sharply divided in appearance, attire and speech, that they displayed most deep seated differences of view point bound up with general conditions and circumstances in various lands, etc. The mere fact that Jews have come from different lands for the purpose of considering a subject of common interest, would not *ex proprio vigore* constitute them a people without territory and a "will to power." The delegates to a World Jewish congress are no different than are the delegates to a World disarmament congress or a World Christian congress.

THE RACE MYTH

From a practical standpoint Jewish raciality is no different than Gentile raciality. To quote Mr. Emerson, "The Normans came out of France into England worse men than they went into it one hundred and sixty years ago. They had lost their own language and learned the Roman's or barbarous Latin of the Gauls, and had acquired, with the language, all the vices it had names for. Twenty thousand thieves landed at Hastings. These founders of the House of Lords were greedy and ferocious dragons, sons of greedy and ferocious pirates. It took many generations to trim, and comb, and perfume the first boat-load of Norse pirates into royal highnesses and most noble Knights of the Garter; but every sparkle of ornament dates back to the Norse boat."

It may be that 20,000 Orthodox Jews from Palestine landed on the shores of England, France, and Germany, in the distant past, bringing with them as part of their luggage the Torah, the Talmud, the Mishna and many eastern customs; but the last 100 years succeeded in combing, trimming and perfuming their descendants into clean, upstanding, liberty loving men and women. Whatever may be the virtue of a person claiming to be of a certain race it certainly is folly for a group to claim racial identity. In the first instance, it involves a scientific investigation in order to determine the racial status of the individual; in the second instance, it involves a group consciousness which inevitably implies a superiority or inferiority complex.

"History," says Professor John Dewey, "proves what a dangerous thing it has been for men, when they try to impose their will upon other men, to think of themselves as special instruments and organs of Deity. The danger is equally great when an *a priori* reason is sub-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

stituted for a divine Providence." Our claim to superior racial status is as dangerous as such claims are when asserted by any other groups. Whatever is unbecoming to a non-Jew is an absolute misfit when applied to a Jew. The racial claim of Jews should be viewed in the same light as we view the racial claims of the Nordics, the Teutons, and the descendants of the Mayflower. In the absence of a definite basis for distinctive raciality, the claim to racial identity is without foundation and exists only because men were ever ready to yield to the doctrine of superiority of blood or race. A racial superiority complex is no different than Bernhardt's notion that the German spirit is the spirit of freedom, of complete intellectual self-determination; that the Germans have always been the standard bearers of free thought.

In spite of all learning, in spite of all logic, and in spite of all wisdom, we persist in making the mistakes of dividing the human family into Men and Women and Jews; the French nation with Jews in it, the German nation with Jews in it, the English nation with Jews in it, and the American nation with Jews in it.

Every Gentile has in him everything that a Jew has, and every Jew possesses the same fundamental characteristics of every Gentile. The attributes of fear and courage; love and hate; virtue and vice, can be found in one as omnipresent as in the other, but we prefer to use a microscope for the purpose of finding something in us that will indicate the difference. When we find it we discover that it really does not matter. The wisest Jew, be he rabbi or scientist, when pressed to point out the difference, cannot suggest anything more substantial than the disposition of Jews to look for Jewish names in the obituary notices; the desire of this or that Jew to be

THE RACE MYTH

buried in a Jewish cemetery; or the awakening of some sort of sympathy in the Jewish breast when he hears of a massacre against Jews. If this proves that we are a race, then may the spirit of Isaiah defend us.

In spite of Graetz, Harris, Radin and others, Jewry tenaciously clings to the racial idea without regard to the fact that it is a result of an intellectual error and redounds to their great disadvantage. The persistence of the racial notion is the more perplexing because there is no scientific or philosophic authority for it; while all authority seems to be against it. Braca stated, writes Dr. Maurice Fishberg, that it is his opinion the Jews are not a pure race, but a mixture of various races. The blond Jews in Alsace-Lorraine and Germany have their origin in inter-mixture with northern races; in Russia there are evidences of mixtures of Jews with Slavonians, Finns and Tartars. The view that there are two racial types of Jews has been shared by many other anthropologists. Stieda, who was the first to investigate the problem in Russia, arrived at the same conclusion which is shared by Topinard, Deniker, and Weisbach.

Other anthropologists, says the doctor, have seen in the Jews more than a mixture of two races. C. Ikof, basing his opinion on measurements obtained of 120 Jews in Russia, and 55 Jewish and Karaite skulls derived from Russia, Turkey, Italy, Caucasia, etc., concludes that only the Jews of the Orient and in Southern Europe are of Semitic origin with only a slight inter-mixture of other racial elements. The Jews in western Europe are possessed of all the morphological evidences of a strong mixture of Semitic blood with indigenous populations of those countries. "It is thus seen," concludes the doctor, "that most of the modern anthropologists who have studied the phys-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

ical characteristics of the Jews, have strongly discredited the theory of the racial purity of the Jews. At the present there are no scientific writers on the subject who claim that the Jews are the direct descendants of Shem, the son of Noah, and that during the last 4,000 years have not admitted any non-Jewish blood into their veins through inter-marriage or conversion to Judaism."

It should be borne in mind that if the anthropologists cited by Dr. Fishberg had made an investigation as to the racial status of the non-Jews they would have arrived at the same conclusion. The Gentiles are not a pure race, but mixtures of various races. The blond Gentiles in Alsace-Lorraine and Germany have their origin in intermixture with northern races. The Christians in Russia present evidence of mixtures of Slavonians, Finns, Tartars and Jews.

No matter from which angle one tackles the racial problem he arrives at the conclusion that "Race is a humbug."

CHAPTER VI

UPSTREAM

“UPSTREAM,” said Rabbi Solomon Goldman of Chicago, “Jewry traveled these many centuries.” Jewry became possessed of the curiosity to learn what is meant by “Upstream.” Until the last one hundred years Jewry’s struggle was entirely devoted to the preservation of Judaism which to every Jew meant the belief in God and the observance of the Torah; and because the task met with political and economic difficulties, Jewry’s course was up stream. The path which lead to the abandonment of the Sabbath, the Torah, the earlocks and beard; the kashreth and the taleth, was downstream and was followed by only a few courageous souls first, and finally by the mass. The upstream fight was against the current which threatened to carry the Jews into free association with Gentiles, a condition now fully consummated.

Upstream the Jewish people fought their way in the endeavor to observe the laws against eating pork, and many chose to be burned at the stake rather than violate God’s law, with the result that today bacon and eggs is as common among us as it is among non-Jews.

Up and upstream our forefathers fought against recognition of secular learning, torturing every soul that had the courage to follow the truth, until today human knowledge is ours, and the cheder is maintained as a sort of evidentiary fact of our reverence for what once was the life of a people.

It has been a terrific upstream struggle within the house of Israel to retain the union between the Jewish

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

religion and Jewish nationalism; today the Jew abhors the thought of such a union anywhere except, of course, in Palestine where it is claimed a Jewish nation can and should be founded on Jewish religion.

The downstream current against which "we" are so proud to have fought was in reality the current of progress and civilization towards which we, as men and women, have contributed our full share; but our rabbis would have us believe that at all times we kept our eyes in the opposite direction. One glance backwards will show us how far we have traveled in the path which leads from the East to the West.

There is nothing in modern thought, science, or philosophy which does not receive the whole hearted support of Jews everywhere; but we still listen to the reading of the Story of Creation and damnation contained in Genesis, and we repeat the story of Exodus as if it were the greatest achievement of human experience. Upstream our ancestors fought in the hope that at the head of the river of life stands Messiah with his Shofar, ready to lead us into the Promised Land, until today we are ready to collect any amount of funds to enable "the other fellow" to leave his native land and find himself a place in the barren desert on the Jordan, while we enjoy the blessings of the New Zion on the Hudson.

"Here, in this land of yours, every man and woman," says Professor Einstein, speaking of the United States, "is proud and jealous of his or her rights as a citizen of a common country . . . that allows every member of the community, regardless of birth or background, to develop all his talent for the benefit of the community as a whole . . . where all those who contribute to the ultimate result are not only filled with a justifiable pride in

UPSTREAM

the state which they happened to found and maintain, but also where they are willing and eager to bring certain occasional sacrifices for the benefit of the community at large." The great scientist did not intend to include all Gentiles and exclude all Jews from this reference to America, but he spoke of the American nation consisting of men and women without regard to their "birth or background."

The upstream struggle of which the Lewisohns, the Brandeises, and the Herzls were and are so conscious, is not in reality a struggle for the preservation of great principles or doctrines against which the Gentiles are arrayed, but the struggle for admission into the social community of these Gentiles with the privilege to still remain the chosen people. An upstream fight should not yield to such trivial considerations. Michael Servetus was not burned at the stake because he was proud of the achievements of his ancestors; and the Maccabean mother and her sons were not subjected to death on the flames because she insisted on preserving the memory of the past, but because she chose to observe the laws commanded her by her Maker.

During the last half of the nineteenth century our people perceived the idea that in the upstream struggle their ancestors carried paraphernalia which impeded their progress; and slowly this paraphernalia has been tossed overboard. Along the shores of the stream that carried mankind from darkness and superstition to freedom and equality there lie scattered the beard and payeth, the shtreimel and the chipect, the twilim and the taleth, the mizuzah and the tcicess, the Sabbath and the Kashreth, and hatred and pride. We dare not ask our children to pick these up and retrace their steps, and if we did, it

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

would not avail us, for they have traveled with the current of human progress even farther than it was thought possible. Of course, there are still people who, having missed the significance of the progress made by the present generation of Jews, continue to jabber about the unconquered Jews. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise thinks that it is just as improper for Mr. George Bernard Shaw to suggest that the Jews had better stop being Jews and become human beings as it would be to suggest that Roman Catholics should become Parsees or that the British become Italians. In the struggle upstream, the Roman Catholics preserved their belief in the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and the divine authority of the Pope; but would they still remain unconquered Roman Catholics if they had abandoned this belief as the Jews of the "Wise" type have abandoned the beliefs of their fathers and preserved in the words of Rabbi Wise "not the faith in monotheism *per se*, but faith in the spiritual sovereignty of the universe, faith in the reality of moral values, faith in the worth-whileness of the battle for human justice and equity." It is not for this faith but for the faith in God and the Torah that the Jew of old struggled against every current, and if he has only left the faith described by Rabbi Wise, then he is completely in the human sea splashing in the waters with the rest of the children of man.

In our crustacean progress upstream we succeeded in crawling out of the little nooks and crevices that cramped the growth of our ancestors, and now find ourselves in the broad waters of the ocean, but we have brought along with us fancy little self-forged chains clamped around our minds, which we rattle now and then for the amusement of our offspring and for self-adulation. One of these is

UPSTREAM

the idea that although the ancient little tome has been stripped of all divine authority we still refer to it as our law. We do not invoke it at any time for authority to fix rents or interests, but we fling it in the face of every rational argument against our general attitude. "Once a Jew always a Jew," we say is our law. What authority approved this law? Upon what reason is it founded? Why is it binding upon us any more than is a decree promulgated by the Pope binding upon the Protestants? The status of no human being can be forever fixed by any but natural law. It would indeed be a great tragedy if our support of the binding forces of rabbinical law were a reality; fortunately it is a pretense and nothing more. There is not a Jew living who would not laugh at any one earnestly urging us to abide by the laws promulgated by rabbis or priests; but he will listen to anyone talking of the universal justice about which the prophets of twenty centuries ago spoke, and swell up with pride.

In our upstream course we have brought with us a childish notion that every adverse reference to one Jew is intended for all Jews and is actuated by a dislike of the Jews as a people. When a number of hoodlums or dramatic critics chose to hiss the late Madame Sarah Bernhardt in Paris, Jews charged the French people with being anti-Semitic, although the lady was a Christian by faith and Nordic by complexion; but when an audience hisses Madame Galli-Curci, we conclude that perhaps the dear lady has lost her cunning. When the nomination of a Jew to the Supreme Court of the United States is subjected to an investigation by a Senatorial Committee, Jews everywhere rise en masse and shout "anti-Semitism," in spite of the fact that every nominee before and since has been subjected to the same sort of

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

investigation and many have been rejected. When a simple automobile maker acquires great wealth and becomes the owner of an insignificant sheet, and prints something about Jews that is utterly false, we refuse to ride in his cars and file damage suits for defamation of the Jewish character, while the charge by Maurice Samuel that we are "a destructive influence in the life of every people" is permitted to go unchallenged.

Through the intervention of the Anti-Defamation League, we have succeeded in muzzling the non-Jewish press to the extent that newspapers in America abstain from pointing out that any person unfavorably referred to is a Jew, but we permit our own publications to refer to Jews in a most shameful manner. Let any Jew imagine himself reading in a non-Jewish newspaper this item; "Miss Thyra Samter Winslow had called up an employment agency to secure a stenographer. Having been asked if she minded a Jewess, she said, 'Why, of course not.' So along came an almost grotesque parade of little Jewish girls, brazen and gum chewing, their faces over-painted and their necks underwashed, their bodies squeezed into loud colored clothes, their high-heels run down carelessly. While they waited for her in the living room they smoked her cigarettes and threw ashes on the rugs. After such a session, Mrs. Winslow called the agency and said, 'If that is the best you have among the Jews, send me a Gentile.' " And yet this very item appeared in a Chicago Jewish weekly of November 15, 1930. If we only realized that these girls were the children of immigrants; the first generation of Jews who discarded Jewish customs and traditions, we should understand how far we really traveled from the upstream course of our fathers.

UPSTREAM

Now imagine reading in some secular newspaper the statement that "In the State of New York, a Jew, Herbert Lehman, is Democratic candidate for Governor. In the same State, a Jew, George Z. Medalie, is Republican candidate for United States Senator. In the State of Illinois, a Jew, Judge Henry Horner, is Democratic candidate for Governor. In the State of Ohio, a Jew, Gilbert Bettman, is Republican candidate for United States Senator." The language is quoted from the *B'nai B'rith* of November, 1932. The same language when appearing in a non-Jewish publication is at once designated as anti-Semitic and calculated to raise a religious issue; but when published by any Jewish publication it is accepted as good business.

As a matter of fact, the Jews of old never traveled together either up or downstream. "A bitter conflict almost steadily raged between the great prophets and the kings," says Rabbi Samuel S. Cohon in the *Jewish Layman* of January, 1931. "Under the new political order of kingship, Israel ceased to be the oppressed nation, and not infrequently took the part of oppressor. Ambitious to make Israel like other nations, the kings, like temporal rulers of all countries, laid the greatest stress upon the nation's physical strength, territorial expansion, and material prosperity. To attain their goal, they maintained standing armies, waged offensive as well as defensive wars, drafted the freemen for state service and levied back-breaking taxes upon the people. . . . The men who were truly downed with the spirit of God refused to believe that God had delivered Israel from Egyptian bondage only to surrender it to the new bondage of its own kings and tyrants." This must be the upstream struggle our rabbis and poets are talking about, but Jewry fol-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

lowed the opposite course during the last hundred years.

If we were to retrace our steps and reach the head of the stream we should again maintain standing armies, wage offensive wars, draft freemen into military service and levy back-breaking taxes upon the people. We are glad to have been at last delivered from the bondage of our own or any other kings.

In our upstream struggle we left the ghetto, but we lament the fact that in Rome the Jewish ghetto has been destroyed. "The ancient Roman ghetto by the River Tiber," writes a Jewish journalist, "Without doubt one of the most unique phenomena of Jewish life in Goluth, is gone. Where but a few months ago a vibrant Jewish life was pulsating, there now remains a few half-destroyed buildings as the last vestige of the quondam ghetto. It has fallen a victim to the Fascist passion for beauty, and under Mussolini's order the ghetto has been razed. . . . When the walls of the ghetto fell in 1870 . . . the ghetto residents declined to leave the walls within which they had suffered so much in the hope of a more promising and brighter future." The ghettos in all lands are slowly disappearing; shall we rebuild them again? Are the Jews of Riverside Drive, in New York, desirous to go back into the ghetto in Hester Street? Is Palestine to be rebuilt into a ghetto where the old and young might again be able "to sit in front of their shops and discuss their joys and sorrows for all to hear, and where the laughter, cries and noise of the ghetto children may be heard far into the night?"

Jews who have accepted the advantages of modern civilization rejoice in the destruction of ghettos everywhere and cannot be persuaded to return to the ghetto life of their ancestors.

UPSTREAM

Today some Jews are wondering whether or not after the overthrow of the monarchy in Spain the Jews "will be granted more freedom in their communal and religious life than were allowed them under the monarchy." Is it admitted that the Jews in Spain are unprepared to take their place as citizens but desire only to maintain their communal and religious life even as the Jesuits? Was the establishment of a republic in Spain the achievement of the Gentiles or was it the culmination of the efforts and the wisdom of the Spanish people? Are the Jews of Spain included among those responsible for the banishment of the king and the church, or are they still willing to be counted among those present but not voting? Face about and look at the truth and you will find that the Jews were as responsible for the establishment of a republic in Spain and the overthrow of the authority of the Church in that country as in any other where freedom reigns.

Every now and then something happens to a Jew which leads the rest of Jewry to think that the upstream course towards the ghetto is still being followed. *The New Palestine* of May 15, 1931, reports the news that Mr. Franz O. Mendelssohn, the great-grandchild of Moses Mendelssohn, had been elected to the presidency of the International Chamber of Commerce, and that that body had listened to a Hebrew message from the Manufacturers Association of Palestine, which depicted in terms of facts and figures the new life that is arising in the Jewish national home. "Nothing," says the editor, "could epitomize the strange twists of Jewish history more strikingly than these two incidents; the one an epilogue of an epoch that has passed, the other the prologue of a new era of glory."

Once again the cob-webbed part of the Jewish mind

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

presents a statement that is false and unfounded. The election of the great-grandson of Moses Mendelssohn to be the president of the International Chamber of Commerce is not an epilogue of an epoch that has passed, but is conclusive evidence of Jewish emancipation resulting in the elimination of anti-Semitism. It proves that Judaism had made progress in the direction of becoming westernized and free of ghetto shackles. It portends an era of equality and freedom. The second incident is not a "prologue of a new era of glory" but a symptom of the old disease that manifests itself in feeble efforts to return to the ghetto.

Only the intellectually blind can fail to note that the promotion of group life, centered around ancient religious traditions and cultures is a return to the ghetto. There may be some glory in a Jew being elected president of an International Chamber of Commerce; but there can be no glory in a group of people striving to perpetuate ghetto life.

*"In the ghetto, friend, the ghetto
Where all hopes at birth decay,
There my mother bore and nursed me,
There my childhood passed away."*¹

¹Raskin: *My Birthplace*.

CHAPTER VII

OLD CLOTHES

TRIUMPH WRITES A SIGN

*In the sky, discouraged,
Triumph writes a sign!
High across the heavens,
O'er our fate malign;
Battleships of progress
Proudly plow their way
Through the dead traditions
Of Old Yesterday.*

“ARROW-HEAD.”

THERE are stages in the business of serious life, says Thomas Paine, in which to amuse is cruel, but to deceive is to destroy; and it is of little consequence, in the conclusion whether men deceive themselves, or submit, by a kind of mutual consent, to the impositions of each other. If Jewry is still “full of the vigor of life” and possesses the quality of submitting its existence “to scrutiny and debate” our duty is to discover, if we can, what falsehoods, and what deceits, are being imposed upon us by others; what is there in us, as Jews, of true value and what of worthless dross. Our business is not so much concerned with the question of “giving up the ghost,” as it is with the propriety of preserving ghosts, by a kind of mutual consent, which have been created for us in the childhood of our existence.

All through the ages when one spoke of Jews, he referred to people who adhered to the belief in a personal God and religiously observed all His commandments.

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

When one discussed Judaism he was not understood as having reference to the people, but to the religion for which Jews were so willing to suffer and die. Whenever a Jew was submitted to the tortures of the rack or the flames of the stake, it was for persisting to live according to his own laws. Whether there was any merit in his choosing to be burned to death rather than eat pork, is beside the question; the fact is that Judaism of the past had in it real substance and it might well have been considered the life of the people. The beliefs of those Jews were not a result of learning, culture, or education, but were founded upon God and the Torah. There was nothing in the teaching at Cheder or Yeshivah concerning biology, anatomy, zoology, embryology, physiology, or history. No graduate of a Hebrew school 100 years ago possessed any information on any scientific subject; his horizon of thought was encompassed by the beliefs imposed upon him by so-called prophets concerning the creation of the world and divine control of human conduct.

Whether we, today, approve or disapprove of the religious convictions of the Jewish people of the past, we must admit that they were real and vital. Those who still adhere to the old beliefs, whom we call orthodox, are as firmly anchored to Judaism and are as far from advanced thought as were their ancestors. In Jerusalem today, like in every Jewish ghetto, the old Judaism is still holding the people within its grip. The Jerusalem of those whose permanent habitation she is, writes Professor Horace M. Kallen, has no hue and is drab; the inhabitants barter or battle or beg their daily bread in her slums and hovels. "Here is the home of beggars; here the people live and work and breed and die. Here is the native habitat of

OLD CLOTHES

the Metropolitan Jew of Palestine. Here you see the true Jerusalemite, his son and his son's son, his synagogue and his home; his rabbi and his rites in the fullness of their glory. It is an unspeakable slum." During the past one hundred years, because of the Jew's wandering out of his cheder and taking a peep into the learning of non-Jews, he has traveled away from the Judaism of his fathers, but he yammers about a new modern up-to-date Judaism which he does not understand and which his rabbi expresses in complicated terms.

No Jew should be afraid to examine Jewish religion generally and his individual religion in particular, and if he finds in his practices things which do not fit in with modern life and thought, he should not hesitate to weed them out. Rabbi Louis J. Moss, of the United Synagogue of America, at the convention of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, October, 1931, admitted that there "are certain practices hallowed, as it were, by tradition, which do not find root in the fundamental tenets of our faith, but which derive their sanction from antiquity and long usage. We must not refuse to re-examine them in the light of present day knowledge and experience with the purpose of determining their present value and import. There is no reason for clinging to outworn traditions in the belief that what was good yesterday will be good enough tomorrow."

A rabbi in the old days was a person who instructed and directed his congregation in the ways of the Lord, today the rabbinat, writes a Chicago rabbi, is the section of Jewry which may know more or less of Jewish literature (not religion), but must have a button somewhere about his person which can be pressed at any time and a stream of eloquence flow forth to charm the multitude.

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

The laity has built temples for the dissemination of Judaism, has bought prayer books for use, has welcomed rabbis to whom it has said that the congregation is ready to live into the Jewish life and to gain a Jewish Weltanschauung, but has not had the strength to go on with the program. There is not a rabbi who upon graduation . . . does not have a deep desire to carry the Jewish message to his first congregation. He begins preaching . . . and soon a friend tells him that he ought to preach on current topics. He preaches on live topics and some one tells him that he ought to be preaching from the Bible. He preaches from the Bible and some one tells him that he ought to get away from the old book and from those old characters; he does that and pretty soon he finds that he is being thundered at from the seats of the professors and is being told that he is degrading and secularizing Judaism and he should not speak from books and plays, but should stick to the Bible. Then the rabbi feels that . . . perhaps old traditions should be subjected to examination. It may even be that in the light of a new achievement in criticism, the whole foundation of Judaism must be re-examined.

Another rabbi finds that any attempt to preach real Judaism invariably meets with the opposition of the leading members of the congregation. Mr. Alfred Segal in a Jewish weekly, relates the experience of a rabbi who sought to impress his congregation with the religious fervor of Isaiah and he suffered the pains for being brave. He had taken for his text in a sermon the coat of many colors that Joseph wore, and in some way he applied it to the current social sins. A committee called on him and informed him that he hurt the cloak and suit business, and it was this cloak and suit business that built the temple and was paying his salary. He next chose for his text

OLD CLOTHES

a verse from Isaiah, "Because the daughters of Zion are haughty and walk with outstretched necks . . . the Lord will take away the beauty of their anklets . . . the crescents, pendants and the bracelets . . . the ankle chains, the rings and the nose jewels." The committee met and decided that he positively insulted them, . . . "made fun of our jewelry, our rings, our bracelets . . . He had attacked the jewelry business . . . He is a radical." Now this brave rabbi occupies a different pulpit where he lectures on the advantages of the Boy Scout Movement.

Some of the modern rabbis claim that the idea of God which has been the foundation upon which the whole Jewish ideology has been built is old fashioned and out of date. He ought to be eliminated entirely. Thus does the modern rabbi become an institution which does not find root in the fundamental tenets of the Jewish faith. How long will we continue to cling to this outworn tradition? How long can any people cling to a rabbi hallowed only by name?

There can be no priest without a church and without a definite religious conception. There can be no rabbi sans God, san Torah. Our institutions called temples are only lecture rooms and social centers; our rabbis are cultured gentlemen who, for hire, undertake to keep their congregations together as a social group without regard to the religious beliefs or non-beliefs of the members constituting the group. The terms "rabbi" and "temple" belong to religious people and should not be bandied about by those who proclaim that Judaism is not a religion. Rabbi Tobias Schanfarber, speaking of a statement made by Dr. Nisson Touroff that those rabbis who are attacked by scepticism on the subject of God should resign from their pulpits, says that if rabbis should follow the sug-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

gestion of Dr. Touroff, a large proportion of the Jewish people of the country would be without rabbis.

The Sabbath is based upon the theory that God, through Moses, had commanded the Jewish people to observe that day and keep it holy. But, the modern rabbi concedes that "the whole theory of revelation has been changed. One speaks of revelation but means something quite different than what is meant by it ordinarily. The miraculous intervention has faded away and the thunders have been stilled. Sinai's mountain top is deserted . . . a festival that bases itself on an old conception of revelation . . . cannot be very cogently attractive in these days." If revelation means something else than what it had meant to our fathers, and the observance of Sabbath is not in pursuance of God's command, then the Sabbath has no significance in our lives. If, through the development of industry and commerce, things have so arranged themselves that we, together with our other fellow citizens, have reached a point where we end our week's labor on Saturday and close our shops for Sunday, that ought to be the end of it. Sabbath cannot be observed by going to temple Friday evening and listening to the rabbi discussing a popular novel. The Sabbath is the shadow of itself of long ago and, as the sun of enlightenment rises to mid-heaven, this shadow too must recede into yesteryear.

The Jewish Almanac of 1932 designates the year 5693 as "the creation of the universe." For those who still believe that 5693 years ago God in his wisdom concluded to and did create the universe, the date has a deep significance; but what meaning has it for those who have accepted the conclusions of modern scientists that it took millions of years for the earth to become what it is today,



סופר

Chicago Jewish Chronicle

THE RABBI

OLD CLOTHES

and that humans have developed from some lower animal? If, like the Fundamentalist, we believe in the "Rock of Ages," Rosh Hashonah is a day to be religiously observed; but if the age of rocks tells us a truthful story, then surely the Jewish New Year is nothing more than a bad verbal habit.

If our New Year does not represent the beginning of Creation, what does it represent? It was perfectly proper for our fathers, who had accepted the biblical story of Creation, to revere the New Year; but what is its significance for us who reckon time as of A. D., in all our interests in life? Stripped of its divine character Rosh Hashonah loses all of its meaning and our retaining it is as absurd as is the wearing of a cross by an atheist. Rosh Hashonah may "derive its sanction from antiquity and long usage"; but if upon examination in the light of present day knowledge it proves to be a tradition of no value or import, we should not refuse to discard it. The idea of ignoring everything that had occurred during the last two thousand years which tended to free mankind from the chains of ignorance, and revering a festival that has no greater significance than has the adoration of the Ganges River by the superstitious Hindus, is entirely out of harmony with human progress.

The observance of Rosh Hashonah and Yom Kippur often carries the Jews from the sublime to the ridiculous. Rabbi Herman Lissauer of Los Angeles, realizing that the difference between the religion of the modern Jew and the modern Christian is insignificant, and that some common ground ought to be found upon which both could meet, established a humanistic organization in his city which continued to function for about two years. During that period the society observed high holiday

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

services on Rosh Hashonah and Yom Kippur in one of the churches of Los Angeles. Keeping in mind the significance of these high holidays for our fathers, the observance of them in a church under the auspices of a humanistic society is not only sacrilegious but absurd.

Let us begin by frankly admitting that we no longer accept the biblical story of Creation; science has put the kibosh on this childish idea about God filling the universe with land, water, skies, stars and planets; animals and humans with appendixes and poisonous tonsils. The first chapter of the Bible should now be relegated to witches, miracles, and evil spirits. Rosh Hashonah should not be desecrated by unbelieving men and women but should be left to those who still follow the law of the Lord.

There are some modern Jewish scholars who claim that Pessach is a festival which the ancients observed as indicating the time between the dead of winter and the returning life of summer. There are some who maintain that Pessach is the commemoration of a day when "for the first time in human history" a group of people rebelled against slavery, and is therefore symbolic of liberty and freedom.

Whatever interpretation we, of today, may give to Pessach, the fact, nevertheless, remains that for thousands of years Jews in every land observed this festival as a religious rite with all the ceremonies and rigmarole which surrounds every church or synagogue ritualistic function. Our fathers considered the observance of this festival as sacred as the observance of the law against eating the swine or shaving the beard. They gathered no inspiration from the hagudah against slavery or oppression, and no revolution in which they have ever participated had been justified on principles annunciated in

OLD CLOTHES

Exodus. There is no quarrel with the Jew who observes his Pessach as a religious rite, but what becomes of it when the only evidence of its observance is the decoration of the table with matzos while eating freshly baked bread? If the story that came from Egypt is mythology, what purpose does a proforma observance of Pessach have today? Without the religious element Pessach is another one of those practices "hallowed by tradition." Pessach cannot be retained as a Jewish festival independent of its religious significance; you cannot mix roast pork and applesauce with matzos and gefiltch fish.

For more than two thousand years our people considered Purim a day for rejoicing, impressed with a feeling that somewhere in the distant past a Jewish Joan of Arc led the hosts against oppression and established peace and righteousness. The story of Esther is only a repetition of the story of the Jews in Egypt. Once more the objection is found against the Jewish laws and customs which segregate them from the nation in which they live. "There is a certain people scattered abroad," says Haman, "and dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of thy kingdom; and their laws are diverse from those of every people; neither keep they the king's laws; therefore it profiteth not the king to suffer them." The immediate cause of Haman's displeasure is the refusal of Mordecai properly to salute this high official in the king's court. Mordecai did not rebel against oppression or slavery; the fact that Esther had been captured by the king's servants and made to yield to the king's desires does not prevent Mordecai from betraying a conspiracy against the life of the king, promoted probably by Haman. He assumes an attitude of defiance because he has a "drag" with the king. Is not his niece the king's favorite con-

cubine? By his superior attitude he brings down upon the Jews the wrath of Haman.

When through the unwilling interposition of Esther, Haman and his sons are hanged, Mordecai obtains power from the king, gathers the Jews together and "on the fourteenth day they slew three hundred men and then slew seventy and five thousand." Our commemorating that event becomes us just as much as would become the Indians in Oklahoma to celebrate the Fort Dearborn massacre. Purim ought to go where our Mizuzah has gone, even though Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof of Chicago considers the story "the essence of all the history of the Jewish people."

If new discoveries justify a re-examination of old traditions, why not pause for a moment and ascertain the historic meaning of Yom Kippur? What sort of milestone in the development of human society is this day? Whatever did happen at any time in the past which is being commemorated on Yom Kippur? How does Yom Kippur compare with the day when men compelled a mighty monarch to guarantee that no man shall thereafter be deprived of his life, liberty or property without due process of law or the judgment of his peers? There is not a word of protest against slavery or oppression in all of the prayers on Yom Kippur.

"To what purpose is the multitude of sacrifices unto me?" "Bring no more vain ablutions; it is an offering of abomination unto me: New Moon and Sabbath, the holding of convocations . . . your New Moon and your appointed seasons My Soul hateth; they are a burden unto me: I am weary to hear them." Thus spoke the prophet Isaiah; but to what avail? After having left out everything that constituted Judaism we persist mockingly to

OLD CLOTHES

observe the New Moon, the Yom Kippur, and the Sabbath in a manner which should make the prophet turn over in his grave.

A writer in a Chicago Jewish weekly, lamenting the sorry state of Judaism which brings its followers to the altar once a year, speaks of the Jews' Yom Kippur and Peripatetic Jews, and wonders "what is to become of this our Judaism and whither are we going?" Hosea speaking of the Jewish Nation says: "I will cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her New Moons, and her Sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts." The modern observance of Jewish festivals is a travesty on the festivals which were so disgusting to the earnest prophets of ancient Jewry.

The so-called traditional observance of Jewish holidays is largely if not entirely responsible for the discrimination against Jews in the matter of employment. Notoriously, Jewish industrial, financial, and commercial institutions, even in America, employ Jews with considerable reluctance. No Jewish establishment would dare to fill its departments largely with Jews for fear that there would be no one on the job on Yom Kippur. The *Mentor* in the *London Jewish Chronicle* writes: "Several complaints have recently reached me from Jews concerning the difficulty of finding employment on account of their being of our people . . . The difficulties that are met with by Jewish employees are not a few. Some of those who write to me bitterly complain that they are bound, if they find work, to give up their religion . . . they have to be at their job on Sabbath and holidays, and to the conscious (not religious) Jew that is indeed a hard measure . . . One young man writes to tell me how he applied to a gentleman holding a prominent position in the com-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

munity—a synagogue warden and that sort of thing—and after an interview was engaged. But he was astonished to be told that only usual general holidays and Sundays were allowed.”

There is a strong impression among our people that the Jews had created something of inestimable value during the period of their existence as a nation in Palestine, and it is claimed that given again a land of their own they will once more create and achieve. Create and achieve what? Mr. James Ferguson, the historian of architecture, more than fifty years ago, said that it is one of the peculiarities of the Jewish history that all we know of them is derived from their books (Bible, etc.). Not one monument, not one sculptured stone, not one letter of an inscription, not even a potsherd remains to witness by a material fact the existence of the Jewish kingdom. No museum ever possessed a Jewish antiquity, while Egypt, Assyria, Greece, and all the surrounding countries teem with material evidence of former greatness and of the people that once inhabited them.

Nothing except the Bible and its concomitant writings had ever been produced by the Jews and even these works, now practically abandoned as divine, have been written by people after the destruction of the Jewish nation as such. In Babylon, while in captivity, those books were composed and, according to all reliable history, the material came from the lore of the Babylonian people. Maimonides, Spinoza, and all of the great men of the Jewish faith, who have contributed so much useful knowledge to mankind, were not part of Palestinian Jewry. Nothing of any value has ever been created in Palestinian territory.

Mr. Ward Morehouse, describes Palestine as it ever

OLD CLOTHES

has been when speaking of Jerusalem, he says, "Finally, we reached my slit of a room (in the Grand New Hotel at Jerusalem), a room with a balcony. This balcony looks down upon a charming alleyway . . . peddlers, goats, rotten tomatoes, over-ripe bananas. Sabbath inertia in the city of Jerusalem. The sights that Jerusalem affords on a May-time Sabbath are, I suppose, the sights of any other Sabbath or any other day—Christians, Moslems, Jews, Bedouins, soldiers, monks, missionaries, camels, sheep, goats, donkeys, dust, heat, flies, peddlers, water-sellers, beggars . . . money changers . . . a woman nursing her baby in the middle of the street." This Jerusalem is not much different than was the Jerusalem of Solomon's day, except for his expensive splendor and numerous wives.

In explanation of the fact that Jews have failed to contribute to the arts we point to the prohibition in the Bible: "Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image, nor any manner of likeness, of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth." (Exodus 20:3.) If Jews have failed to produce art on account of the prohibition in the Bible, this constitutes another reason why that old venerable book has been so generally rejected as a guide for our artistic and intellectual inclinations. If Socrates had believed in the divinity of the Bible, humanity would not have been enriched by his philosophy. If Darwin had accepted the biblical story of Creation, we should today be without the *Origin of Species* and the *Descent of Man*. In the seventeenth century, Baruch Spinoza graduated from a Talmud Torah and entered the Yeshivah where he could have remained a student of Jewish literature and traditions, respected by all the Jews of Amster-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

dam. But he learned Latin, and he was thus enabled to read René Descartes, to whom Spinoza admitted he was indebted for all his philosophical knowledge. Spinoza's fate for departure from the old book was little different from that of Socrates. If the latter's cup was bitter, it only resulted in death, while the former's was a cross that he was forced to carry through life. The rabbis, who had wrecked the spirit of Uriel Acosta, had excommunicated Spinoza, and by their judgment they declared: "By the sentence of the angels, by the decree of the saints, we anathematize, cut off, curse, and execrate Baruch Spinoza, in the presence of these sacred books (Seifer Torah) with the six hundred and thirteen precepts which are written therein, with the anathema wherewith Joshua anathematized Jericho; with the cursing wherewith Elisha cursed the children; and with all the cursings which are written in the Torah; cursed be he by day, and cursed by night; cursed when he goeth out, and cursed when he cometh in; the Lord pardon him never; the wrath and fury of the Lord burn upon this man; and bring upon him all the curses which are written in the Torah. The Lord blot out his name under the heaven. The Lord set him apart for destruction from all the tribes of Israel, with all the curses of the firmament which are written in the Torah. There shall be no man to speak to him, no man write to him, no man show him any kindness, no man stay under the same roof with him, no man come nigh him." All this because he refused to comply with the statutes and ordinances which were divine law with the Jews of his day.

When we speak of Spinoza as a great philosopher that Jewry had produced, we reverse cause and effect. Spinoza is just another great intellect which bigotry and super-

OLD CLOTHES

stition has failed to stifle. We ought to have courage to choose between Rabbi Isaac Abval and Rabbi Saul Morteira on one hand and the Spinozas on the other. There is no middle of the road. The rabbis and the Torah may be Jewish background in the opinion of the Orthodox Jewry, but the spirit of Socrates, Spinoza, and Galileo, is the background of the human race.

But it is not at all true that Jews have produced no works of art. If Assyria, Greece, and Egypt teem with evidences of greatness, who is there that can say that Assyrians, Greeks, and Egyptians of the Jewish faith, have not contributed towards the production of these evidentiary facts? When the Jews in Egypt became numerous and powerful, they probably have participated in the creative genius of the nation as a whole, as the Jews who have become numerous and powerful in the United States of America or the British Empire are now participating in the achievements of these nations. The reason that nothing is found in Jerusalem of a material character as evidence of Jewish grandeur, is due to the fact that the whole career of the nation did not last over four hundred years and these were full of strife, conflict and distraction.

When we have blown all the chaff from our pretense we shall find that what is left is just plain humanity. We shall find that our virtues and vices, our loves and hates, our prejudices and our likes and dislikes are as equal to those of our Gentile neighbors as any one thing can be equal to another; with this exception, however, we praise ourselves without seeing our faults, while our Gentile neighbor, without praising himself, can admirably cuss us.

From every corner of this earth one hears the cry about anti-Semitism as though the non-Jewish portion

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

of humanity has nothing that interests it except persecuting and oppressing the few Jews living among them. Analyze this for just a moment. All the barking of the *Dearborn Independent* failed to reduce the deposits in the notoriously Jewish banking institutions in America or affect the election of any Jew to public office. Solomon Levitan carried 70 out of 71 counties in the State of Wisconsin, with its large German population, for the office of State Treasurer. In the State of Oregon, with a negligible Jewish citizenship, Julius Meyr was elected governor, and in New Mexico, Mr. Arthur Seligman was chosen to occupy the same office. On November 8th, 1932, in the State of New York, where the Jews constituted only 16% of the total population, Herbert Lehman was elected governor, and in Illinois with less than 5% of Jews according to the Jewish year book of 1932, Judge Henry Horner, in the face of a campaign full of the Jewish issue, was elected by such a large majority that if all the Jews had voted for his opponent, the result would not have been changed. All over the United States men of the Jewish Faith are repeatedly elected to public office without any apparent discrimination; and what is our answer?

In spite of the generally admitted truth that self-praise carries an unpleasant odor, and although we are willing to admit that every child that comes into the world does so as a child of humanity, we insist that "whatever the ideal of righteousness there is in the world, it goes back to the teachers of righteousness that arose in the midst of the children of Israel. Whatever failures we recognize in our modern civilization, whatever judgments we pass upon these failures, will be found adjudged and condemned, not out of the thought of this generation but

OLD CLOTHES

out of the winged words . . . of a little group of people whose history runs back now 2700 years. The world ought to be thankful for the survival of the Jews . . . we are companions of the prophets." The Jews are taking biblical history entirely too seriously. They refuse to accept the statement of Lanciani, the great archaeologist, that history is often the direct evidence of fallible human testimony, and is frequently refuted by the circumstantial, tangible evidence dug up from tomb or temple. "Many a triumph," he says, "is unmerited and many a disgrace is an injustice; many a cream-puff personality goes as a hero, and heroes are written down as fools." It is very likely that if the prophets we are talking so much about were alive today, they would find it difficult to secure admission into a Jewish social club. The consciousness that, as Jews, we have nothing to present ourselves, leads us to adopt our ancestors and ancient prophets as our hall marks. Just what do we expect the world to do for us in payment for the prophecies of Jeremiah, whom his contemporaries, with their notions of righteousness, persecuted and finally incarcerated in a jail?

We seem to have an impression that we have established righteousness in the world and that the progress of humankind is in our keeping. "We desire," says Maurice Samuel, "to see justice done in the name of God . . . hate evil and love the good; let Justice run down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream . . . We bring into the world passionately earnest, sincerely earnest righteousness . . . We are trying to rebuild the world to our needs and we unbuild it for the Gentiles . . . We dream of a world of utter Justice . . . we Jews, the destroyers, will remain the destroyer forever . . . nothing that the

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Gentiles will do will meet our needs and demands.”¹

All of these pretenses are very old and as untrue and unreal as is our claim to a loyalty to God and the Torah. The benighted Gentiles in their playful manner, have given humanity railroads, steamships, aeroplanes, and automobiles. They have filled the world with electric power and light, with phonographs and radios, with telegraphs and telephones, with bathtubs and golf courses, with pictures and statuary, with poetry and drama, with theatres and museums, and with liberty and freedom. All of which we enjoy equally with non-Jews. But we say that that all is insignificant compared with what we propose to give in the form of Justice.

Suppose we attempt to tell these poor, misguided Gentiles what we really propose to do. Do we propose to reduce hours of labor and increase wages? It had not been done in Judea 2000 years ago and is not being done in Palestine today. Do we propose to reestablish God's law in the world, when women who sin were stoned to death and witches were burned and the children were charged with the transgressions of their father's even unto the fourth generation? Is there a Jew living who could draw up a bill of particulars which would apprise the Gentiles of what they can expect of us in the matter of Jewish contribution to human happiness? The experience of Jewry during the last fifty years answers the question in the negative. It is generally considered that the press is a barometer of the thought of a people or a community. If we seek to know what a Jewish community is thinking about, we should look to the Jewish Press for information on that subject. Mr. Harry Rosenfeld in *The Reform Advocate* of August 6th, 1932, says:

¹*Maurice Samuel: You Gentiles.*

OLD CLOTHES

“As a rule, the average periodical is a reflection of the life of the community in which it is published . . . What does the subscriber read in the average Jewish Weekly? Stories of sisterhoods planning card parties, luncheons, election of officers . . . Stories of brotherhoods holding smokers, picnics . . . Stories of rabbis delivering ‘stimulating’ sermons on the latest novel or play, stories of bar mitzvahs, confirmations, membership drives, drives to pay off the mortgage on the building or the organ . . . stories of engagements, marriages, births—in short, column upon column of social and personal notes. And when the subscriber turns to the editorial page, providing there is one, he finds burning editorials on Zionism (which must please six or seven factions at the same time); sizzling shots at Hitler . . . ; Watery but elegantly phrased speculations on the Jew in Soviet Russia; saccharine comments on ‘goodwill’ between Jew and Gentile; and gobs of editorial goo on what a wonderful people we really are. But as for reflecting the thought, the ambitions, the struggles, the real life of the community, we hardly find a word! Basing one’s conception of the life of a Jewish community by glancing at these ‘mirrors of life,’ the reader can come to but one conclusion, and that is, that in the community there is neither thought, life or struggle.” Talking about the prophets adds nothing to the community life as reflected in Jewish publications.

The rabbis ought to understand that if we are the equals of Amos, Micah, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, we ought not to lean on those old prophets, but we ought to bring forth something ourselves which we could present to mankind as a remedy for existing unrighteousness and evil. Boasting about our being of the prophets does not help to increase our equality with all the other children

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

woman-begotten.

Another impression of Jewry which should receive intelligent examination is the alleged disposition of Gentiles to keep Jews out of social organizations everywhere. A cursory examination into the causes will soon reveal the fact that the fault lies with ourselves. We still are of the seventeenth century in many of our ways. We still continue like old father Abraham to oppose the marriage of our children to non-Jews. Who of us would like to see our children associate with the children of those who have in advance declared against inter-marriage? Such an association can only result in broken hearts and blasted careers. Discrimination against Jews is not confined to Gentiles. Jews of one kind discriminate against Jews of another kind more emphatically. "Since the beginning of the existence of the Michael Reese Hospital (A Jewish institution in Chicago)," says the author of the *Growth of Jewish Chicago*, "A group of physicians and surgeons, whose fathers were contributors towards its maintenance, formed a sort of monopoly and permitted no Jewish doctor who was not of German descent to become a member of its staff, regardless of his ability or renown. Even the internes, although selected by competitive examination, were, oddly enough, all German Jews. It was far easier for the camel to pass through the needle's eye than for a young doctor of Russian Jewish descent to become an interne in Michael Reese Hospital." If anti-Semitism means dislike of Jews it is more prevalent among Jews than Gentiles. The German Jew hates the Russian Jew, the latter hates the Hungarian Jew and they all hate the Litvaks.

Mr. John Dewey, points out that people in outward activities and current enjoyment, are frantically ab-

OLD CLOTHES

sorbed in mundane affairs in ways which, if they were formulated for intellectual acceptance, would be repudiated as low and unworthy. "We give our emotional and theoretical assent to principles and creeds which are no longer actively operative in life." The life of the Jewish people has always been saturated with beliefs, practices, and customs which antedated the Covenant and Exodus, but have always had the sanction of so-called divine laws. The Dead Hand of the past has ever been and even now is at the throat of our people, and the reverence for this Hand sanctifies all our traditions and supports and maintains our beliefs, practices and customs. Jews in their individual and collective capacities should cease pussy-footing around Judaism as if afraid to awaken some dangerous monster; they should endeavor to learn "where the Dead Hand came from, how it came about, and what is behind its claim to authority."

CHAPTER VIII

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

*"Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel's as other see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us,
And foolish notion."*

“WHEN in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.” So begins the Declaration of Independence promulgated by the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress Assembled in 1776. After frankly stating the causes which impelled them to the separation they solemnly announced that “for the support of this Declaration . . . we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our Sacred Honor.”

Thus did the Christians and Jews bring into existence the American Nation and, with the principle that “all men are created equal,” as its beacon light, the nation developed into its present status. Hither men came in search of opportunities to live, labor and worship in their own way. They came from England, from Spain, from France, from Holland, from Russia and every other part of the world. They brought with them the national cul-

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

tural and religious attributes of the old world. And in the language of Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, "out of the labor of men and the bounty of earth, out of the prayers of men and the hope of the world, God fashioned a Nation."

A casual study of the history of any nation will reveal that the origin of it was the coming together of individuals or groups from other lands, and without in advance pledging themselves to such noble purposes, they finally blossomed forth as a nation, occupying certain territory and having a civil government. The Jews, however, accepting the statement in the Bible that God had created the Jewish nation, argue that they are a nation in spite of the fact that they do not live on a given territory and have had no political government for more than 2000 years. Theoretically, according to what Jewish nationalists tell the world, the Jewish nation stands separate and apart from all other nations, even though every Jew is a citizen of the country where he happens to be enjoying all the rights and privileges accorded any other citizen under the laws of the land. In the United States, under the constitution, the Jew is as well protected in his right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as any other man, and with very few exceptions, this is true of every land today. Yet the Jew continues to stand off to one side claiming that he nationally is still Jewish. One is almost ready to agree with Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, that even though the world has made its peace with the Jews, the Jews refuse to make their peace with the world.

No matter how far our people may go in their protests against the charge that they are a Nation within Nations, every Jew is consciously or subconsciously nationally Jewish. Ask any Jew in the United States what his na-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

tionality is, and as quick as a flash he will reply, "Jewish," and the United States is the finest laboratory within which this subject can best be tested, for here there can be no claim that we have not been accorded equal rights and opportunities.

A Chicago rabbi recently submitted to the public an inventory of Israel's storehouse in which he disclosed that everything that went to make up Judaism is gone, and the only thing remaining worth while fighting for or dying for is the Jewish Nationhood.¹ This rabbi reports that at the end of almost a century of religious conflict in Jewry he finds neither Orthodoxy nor Reform with any victory to record. He finds, rather, "both so impoverished in spiritual and intellectual resources that neither can hope to meet the new challenges of our own day." "The two camps," he says, "from time to time emit rhetorical defiances, neither realizing evidently that each is sinking into a bog of its own making." He finds that all that is left in Jewry's storehouse is some kugel and gefilteh fish, but does not mention the fact that the temple customers have developed a taste for oysters and bacon. He is unable to discover anything remaining on the shelves which could be identified as resembling in the slightest degree what had been known for more than five thousand years as God of Israel.

He reports that much of the merchandise that had been accepted in the past as divine law has been entirely rejected and can no longer be offered among intelligent Jews; but there still is a quantity of goods on the shelves which is labeled "The Jewish Nation." "The nationhood of Israel," says the rabbi, "is an ineluctable fact. The contention of the religionist is so much absurdity. . . . The

¹*Solomon Goldman: A Rabbi Takes Stock.*

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

Jews are a nation . . . the Jew must assume the responsibility of nationhood . . . we accept the nationhood of Israel as axiomatic and in our program we must seek to carry out the implications of this fundamental axiom." "The weakness of the present situation," he continues, "is in a large measure due to our timidity to analyze fundamentals. We campaign breathlessly, build feverishly; we plunge desultorily from one activity into another; we hold conventions and adopt resolutions. But any suggestion to examine the premises upon which we are conducting all these activities is shouted down with cries of 'agnostic, destroyer, intellectuals'! . . . Happily, we cannot seriously hope to crush the spirit of inquiry with excathedra pronouncements. Rhetoric will not silence, much less convince anyone."

If we are to assume the position of a Nation "among the Powers of the Earth . . . a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that we should declare the causes which impel us to the separation," and to indicate frankly and honestly how we propose to maintain ourselves as a Nation among Nations. The word *nation* is defined in Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary as "a people or community associated together and organized under a civil government and ordinarily dwelling together in a distinct territory of its own; an organized body politic; a state."

While this definition may appear incomplete because it does not contain the element of language, the most casual consideration will demonstrate that language is an element a nation develops rather than something that contributes towards the formation of nationhood. After "God had called unto a thousand peoples" the American nation was fashioned. The Yiddish of the Jews, the Ger-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

man of the Germans, the Dutch of the Hollanders, and the Swedish of the Swedes entirely vanished; all became absorbed into the one nation and English became the national language. Language, therefore, is not necessarily an indispensable ingredient of the term *nation* but land and civil government cannot be left out of the definition.

If one should accept Jewish nationhood as an "ineluctable fact"; how would he proceed to define the term *nation* as applied to the Jews? Common History? The Catholics have a common history and yet they are not a nation. Common language? The Catholics have Latin as a common language but that does not make them a nation. Common customs? Are the customs prevailing among the Jews on Riverside Drive, New York, the same as are the customs of the Jews in Hester Street? Take the 3,000,000 Jews of Poland, the 2,000,000 in Russia, the 600,000 in Germany, the 500,000 in Hungary, the 4,000,000 in America, the 300,000 in Austria and the 300,000 in the British Empire and "without timidity or rhetoric" include them into one nation. Have all these people a common history, a common language, common customs or even a common culture?

There is a prevalent impression among our people that Jewish culture is something so definite and overwhelming that it alone is sufficient to constitute us a Nation, but we ignore the fact that culture, like language, is something which a nation develops rather than something that creates a nation. The American nation started out with the culture of England and France and Spain; it developed a variety of cultures which were distinctly Southern, Western, Eastern, and Northern. Where are these cultures now? Like the various languages they have become absorbed and welded into what finally can be

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

designated as the American Culture. Has Jewish culture remained distinct and separate? If so, what is that culture and how can it be defined?

One theory upon which Jewish nationhood is built, although lost sight of in this age, is not previous national existence, particular culture or ethics, but rather the fact that God, in and through His covenant with Abraham, constituted him a nation and promised him a land. It was this theological concept that enabled the rabbis of old to impress the Jewish people everywhere, with the conviction that their nationhood is grounded not upon the action of peoples, but upon a grant from on high, and they wrote that into Genesis and Exodus and embellished it with all sorts of decorations, including the prohibition against mixing with people outside of the Jewish fold, and the coming of a Messiah who would lead all Jews from all the world, even those who have long been dead, into the Promised land. This national concept resulted in cutting Israel off from the community of nations. The Jews developed the conviction, says Mr. Berard Lazare that their God "would, by his mighty right hand, raise the fallen walls of the Temple; they hoped that a prophet would bring them back to the promised land." They had been taught "Do not cultivate strange lands, soon you will cultivate your own; do not attach yourself to any land, for thus will you be unfaithful to the memory of your native land; do not submit to any king, for you have no master but the Lord of the Holy Land, Jehovah; do not scatter amongst the nations, you will forfeit your salvation and you will not see the light of the day of resurrection; remain such as you left your house; the hour will come and you will see again the hills of your ancestors, and those hills will then be the center of the world

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

which will be subject to your power." We do not believe any longer in this sort of nonsense; we do not desire to be taken as people who will not cultivate the land in the country of our nativity; we have already become part and parcel of all the nations on the earth; and, therefore, the old Jewish ideal of nationality has lost its force.

Whatever disagreements there may be among anthropologists on the subject of purity or identity of races, there is no division of opinion on what constitutes a nation, except in so far as they attempt to apply the term to the Jews. Generally the dictionary definition given above is accepted by most writers with slight modifications until they tackle the Jews, when they begin to muddle and fumble. Mr. A. Springer, in his *National Problems*, expresses the idea that a nation is a union of similarly thinking and similarly speaking people. "It is," he says, "a cultural identity of a group of contemporaries which is not connected with country." There is no group of people that can come within Springer's definition of a nation.

The Italian nation, although formed of Romans, Germans, Greeks, and Arabs, is a nation because it occupies a certain territory and has a civil government of its own; the French nation, composed of Gauls, Romans, Britons, and Germans, is a nation because it occupies the country known as France and has a civil government and incidentally speaks the French language. One can carry this idea through all modern nations without interruption and arrive at no other conclusion than that a nation is a group of people occupying a distinct territory and having a civil government of its own, and not a union of similarly thinking and similarly speaking people. Mr. Otto Bauer, in *The National Question and Social De-*

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

mocracy, asks, "What is a Nation? Is it identity of language which combines people into a nation? But Englishmen and Irishmen speak one language without representing one nation. Jews have no common language, but nevertheless constitute a nation."

Bauer makes the mistake of accepting the Jews as a nation and then evolves a definition which would fit the case, concluding that "a nation is a relative identity of character." He knows, of course, that national character is not the creation of the Lord and that the character of people is determined largely by their faith, the climate of the country, the liberty they enjoy under the form of government, and their mode of life. How then can there be a Jewish nation consisting of people born and reared in different countries under various forms of political and economic conditions, speaking different languages and whose faiths are as different as day is from night?

The Jewish nationhood of Theodor Herzl is founded upon the proposition that "the enmity to the Jew was rooted in the rootlessness of the Jewish people. The world is distinctly prejudiced against a people without a land . . . A land must be found for the nine million Jews of the world."

This theory can only be based upon the admission, first, that the Jews are a nation, and, second, that they are such without a land. Even if we admit that every Jew is a descendant of those Jews who at one time constituted the Jewish nation in Palestine, the native-born Jews of Germany would still not be part of a Jewish nation without a land. It may be safely stated that there is not a person living in Germany today whose distant ancestor may not have been driven out of some other land, finally establishing himself in what is now called the city of

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Berlin. Neither the descendants of these nor the descendants of the Jews can fairly be presumed to form separate peoples. A more vivid demonstration of this landless-people idea can be found in the United States. The descendants of the most ancient families, dating back to the Mayflower, are descendants of people who were driven out of their native lands on account of their religious opinions. Surely these descendants are not people without a land.

If it were possible for any group of people to maintain a national status without occupying any given territory the Jews should be able to go along as a nation without admitting the need of any certain land. But our clamor to reclaim Palestine for our nation demonstrates that land is an indispensable element in nationhood. If we should admit that there can be no nation without territory, we shall then be charged with the responsibility of demonstrating that it is conceivable that a nation could have its being on a certain territory with the major part of the men and women of that nation born and living on some other territory.

No matter how far we may go in our claims that Jewish nationhood is not bottomed on theology, we nevertheless, cannot escape the fact that in some form, God is a constituent part of Jewish nationhood, for otherwise it would be unthinkable for Mr. Maurice Samuel to declare to the Gentiles, "your lack of seriousness in religion, is the fact that your religions are not national, that you are not compromised and dedicated en masse to the faith—what value has God for you if you do not surrender to Him, even formally, all your gifts and faculties; all your will and emotions? This is an amazing duality of allegiance; one is an Englishman first, and then a Christian!

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

An American first, and then a Baptist!" Would we like it better if the Gentiles were Catholics first, then Englishmen, or Baptists first and then Americans? What chance would a Jew or a Unitarian have in either of these countries if the people were primarily conscious of being Catholics or Baptists instead of Englishmen or Americans?

One theory of Jewish nationalism is founded upon the proposition that at one time there existed a Jewish nation in Palestine, therefore, all Jews by virtue thereof, constitute a nation although deprived of land and civil government; and Palestine is the only country where Jews can develop into a full and complete nationhood. Will this theory support any kind of nationalism? Suppose there were now a Jewish nation in Palestine with a Jewish civil government and Judaism as the national religion, would all the Jews by virtue thereof, be members of this nation and subject to its jurisdiction, even though they were English or German citizens? Will this Jewish nation in Palestine be founded upon the principle enunciated by a Chicago rabbi that "God is absorbed in the nationalism . . . of Israel. He becomes the national ethos . . . He creates the world in the Hebrew language. He is the National God."² Jews everywhere have played an important part in separating gods and kings from nationalism and they are ready now to lay down their lives in opposition to any religious group attempting to re-establish the authority of any God in any nation. Can we contend that the principle of separation of church and state is applicable to all nations except a Jewish nation in Palestine? A desire to have a Jewish God as the symbol of Jewish nationality is as obnoxious as the desire of the Pope to have a Christian God as the symbol of

²*Rabbi Solomon Goldman: God and Israel*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Spanish nationality.

Col. Robert G. Ingersoll, in his address on "God in the Constitution," has well said: "We have solemnly declared that the people must determine what is politically right and what is wrong and that their legally expressed will is the supreme law. This leaves no room for national superstition—nor room for patriotic gods or supernatural beings. The government of God has been tried. It was tried in Palestine several thousand years ago . . . and the people governed by this God lost their nationality. Theocracy was tried in the Middle Ages. God was the Governor—the Pope was His agent, and every priest and bishop and cardinal (and he might have added rabbi) was armed with credentials from the Most High—and the result was that the noblest and best were in prison, the greatest and grandest perished at the stake. The result was that vice was crowned with honor and virtue whipped naked through the streets. The result was that hypocrisy swayed the sceptre of authority while honesty languished in the dungeons of the Inquisition."

If Jewish nationhood is founded upon the fact that at one time there existed a Jewish nation in Palestine, we must be able to indicate which particular nation we have in mind. An Indian may be an Indian but when he asserts his Indian nationality he traces it to one or another Indian nation which existed on the American continent. An Iroquois Indian is not a Sioux Indian, and an Algonquian Indian is not a Muskhogean. The generic term *Indian* does not cover nationality and the generic term *Jew* does not include Jewish nationality.

While Jews generally consider Jewish nationhood an ineluctable fact, Jewish literature is replete with contradictions on this subject. "When in the year 1882," says

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

Rabbi Moses P. Jacobson, "Dr. A. Kuenen, the epoch-making Bible critic of Holland, issued his volume of Hibbert Lectures, entitled *National Religions and Universal Religions*, in which he pronounced Judaism to be distinctively a national religion, the scholarship and spokesmanship of Israel the world over voiced an undiscordant chorus of passionate protest. The recognized rituals of Reform Judaism had eliminated every prayer expressing so much as even the suspicion of a hope or a desire for any form of Jewish national restoration. The Grand Sanhedrin of Paris, in 1807, has specifically declared that Israel existed only as a religion and no longer looked forward to any national rehabilitation. All over the world even Orthodox Jewry, in order to obtain everywhere the then debated Jewish civil equalities, had been for years strenuously repelling the impeachment that Israel was a nation within the nations. And Reform Judaism in its several rabbinical conferences finally gave the seal of official declaration to this maintenance that Israel was a religious entity, and only a religious entity."

This attitude of the Jews led the proponents of Jewish civil equalities in the English parliament to declare that if England should emancipate the Jew it would fill his heart with consciousness of country and he would think and feel and fear and hope as the Englishman does; his sorrow and his exultation would be the same; at the tidings of English glory his heart would beat with kindred palpitation and in defense of his sovereign and his country his best blood will be poured out with the same heroic prodigality as the non-Jews. Now, although civil equalities have been firmly established by law in nearly every land, Jewish nationalism becomes the philosophy of Israel. Jews should not be surprised if people charge that we

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

obtained equality before the law under false pretenses; that we are still a nation within nations and that rights accorded us should be revoked.

Some Jews contend that Jewish nationhood is founded upon descent, that is to say, all Jews are descendants of those who constituted a Jewish nation in Palestine. Could any living Jew sustain this theory by any competent evidence? Could any living Jew trace his ancestry to Palestine as easily as he could trace it to Russia, Germany, or Holland? Suppose it should be provided by some act of a competent legislature that all descendants of the people who occupied Palestine during the reign of King David, are entitled to inherit the land which formed part of his kingdom and we were notified to bring forth our proof of heirship—how many of us would be able to produce evidence of our claims that would be admissible in a court of law? The fact that we call ourselves Jews would not prove it; the fact that we believe in God and the Torah would not prove it; our membership in a Temple or a Jewish country club would not prove it; our having hooked noses or black hair or large ears would not prove it. There is absolutely no evidentiary fact which, given the most liberal interpretation, would sustain our claims to the inheritance by virtue of ancestry, and there certainly exists no other basis upon which our claim to the land of Palestine could be sustained.

Professor Chaim Tchernovitz of the Jewish Institute of Religion, in an article in the *New Palestine* of June 5, 1931, undertakes to demonstrate that the Jews have a legal title to Palestine. He says: "A study of the legal rights of the Jewish people to Palestine on the basis of Hebrew Law and of International Law is of value not only to the student, but the layman as well, for it leads

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

inevitably to conclusions of utmost importance to the Zionist cause. A brief review of the history of Palestine and Syria after the destruction of the Temple is essential.

"In 395 C. E., following the fall of Rome, Palestine was conquered by the Byzantines, who were obliged to relinquish control of the country to the Arabs in 634. At the end of the eleventh century Syria fell to the Aquiladia, who were later driven out by the Turks. Palestine was then captured several times by the Crusaders, but in 1214 both the Holy Land and Syria were taken by the Mamelukes. The Mongols swept into the land in 1400, but early in the sixteenth century the Turks again took possession and held it until the end of the eighteenth century, when the First Napoleon wrested practically the entire country from them. In 1831, Ibrahim Pasha, ruler over Egypt, took both Palestine and Syria, but in 1840 he was forced to return Palestine to the Turks who held it until the World War, when it was conquered by the English under General Allenby. It must, at the outset, be understood that the current problem between Arabs and Jews is not merely a dispute between the Arabic and Jewish inhabitants of Palestine. Rather does it involve the Arab nation as a whole and the Jewish people, scattered over all the earth as a whole. Both peoples claim the right to Palestine, the Arabs by reason of possession, the Jews by reason of their historic title.

"From the foregoing review it will be noted that Arab *sovereignty* lasted but a comparatively short time—from 634 to the end of the twelfth century of the Common Era. Hence, it may be concluded quite justifiably that the Arabs have no better claim to Palestine than any of the other nations who at one time or another have held dominion over the land. If the Arabs should, in claiming

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

that England has no clear title to Palestine deny the right of conquest by the sword, then *ipso facto*, they yield their own claim, for that is exactly the method they used in taking the country from the Byzantines, who in turn had conquered it from the Romans, and the Romans from the Jews. If, on the other hand, the Arabs recognize the historical rights alone, those are ours. In either case, then, whether the Arabs are guided by the principles of force or Justice they should concede that the Holy Land should belong to the Jews alone. The Bible teaches us that there is an intimate relationship between a people and its land, and that a people can develop best only in its own land . . . Since the Land of Israel was chosen for the People of Israel, their national genius, their psychology—in short, the sum total of their nature is closely bound up with the land.”

The professor presents a claim of title which begins with 395 C. E., after the destruction of the Temple, when the dominion over the land had been assumed by the Byzantines. Between 395 and 1918, a period of over fifteen centuries, sovereignty over this unhappy land had shifted from the Byzantines to the Arabs; from the Arabs to Syria; from Syria to Aquiladia; from Aquiladia to the Turks; then to the Crusaders; from the latter to the Mamelukes; then to the Mongols; back to the Turks and then to the French. From the French dominion was taken over by Egypt, and again by the Turks, and finally by the English.

The Jews during this period were scattered over all the earth and entirely outside of the chain of title, while the Arabs were in continual and uninterrupted actual possession of the land. With these facts before the professor he argues that “the dispute is not between the

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

Arabic and Jewish inhabitants of Palestine but between the Arab nation as a whole and the Jewish people, scattered over all the earth, as a whole." Is there anything in human experience which would support a claim on the part of people scattered over all the earth against the right of those in possession of certain land or a given country? Is it not more logical and in accord with Justice that the possession of any given territory should be determined by the inhabitants of the territory? Robert Burns was right when he said: "No! Never but by British hands shall British wrongs be righted!" It would seem that the right of the inhabitants of Palestine should be settled between them without interference from the Jews scattered over all the earth. No Jew in Timbuktu has any right to inject himself into a dispute between different groups occupying any given territory except his own. The rights of the Jews "scattered over all the earth" are no more involved in Palestine than are the rights of the Negroes scattered throughout all America involved in Africa.

The conclusion of the argument of the professor is significant. He says, "Since the land of Israel was chosen for the people of Israel . . . the sum total of their nature is closely bound up with the land." Of course, if one believes that God chose Palestine for the Jews there may be some force in the statement. It has ever been the contention of aggressors that they are entitled to govern chosen territory because of "Manifest Destiny"—and who does not know that such claims are false and fraudulent. It may be conceded that to the Orthodox Jew, who is convinced of the reality of the Covenant, the claim to Palestine as a matter of right has some merit, but what merit is there to such claims by a Jew who refuses to

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

admit that there ever was a Covenant entered into between God and Abraham? There may even be some reason for believing Jews to insist on some right to locate on the Holy Land, but what rights have Jews to determine the policy of a land in which they do not intend to live and labor? And it is evident that the most active Jewish nationalists do not intend to live in Palestine.

Some of our people accept Jewish nationhood as axiomatic by elucidating a distinction between "Nation" and "Nationality." The first, they, say, is the political status of a people occupying a given territory and having a government of its own; while the second, is the sum total of the history, the culture, the customs, habits, hopes, and aspirations of a given group of people. It is argued that these groups constitute national minorities in every land and the Jews fall within this latter qualifications. That being the fact, it follows that these minorities have an inalienable right to become nations. The Poles are presented as proof of this proposition.

The weakness in this argument is that we ignore entirely the fact that the term "Poles" means the men and women who have always remained on Polish territory, even after their civil government was destroyed by Russia. When the Russian grip was finally released from Poland's throat, and the Poles established a civil government of their own, all the people living on that territory became members of the Polish nation, Jews and Christians and unbelievers alike. If there is still some discrimination there against Jews, it is the business of these Jews to bring about a change, not to run away to Palestine where they have no right to claim citizenship, and where they are likely to be discriminated against just as much by other inhabitants who are not Jews nationally. Such

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

conduct on their part is a repetition of the mistake of Moses when instead of inspiring the Jews of Egypt, as Egyptians, to rebellion within the country of their birth, he led them, as Jews, out into a strange land. Voltaire, speaking of Exodus says, "Moses must have been very timid not to lead the Jews against Pharaoh of Egypt; . . . The Jews should have conquered them easily and should have become the masters of the country. Instead of giving them the fertile country he made them depart from Egypt as cowards to perish in the deserts between mountains and precipices. He might have, at least, conducted them by direct route to this land of Canaan, to which they had no right."

The French citizens of Alsace-Lorraine did not leave that territory when it became part of Germany, and like the Russian nobility after the revolution, scatter all over the world, but remained and continued to hope that some day, through some process, France would again acquire the land and restore to them their homeland. They knew that "you cannot carry your country on the soles of your shoes." The Poles remained in Poland, even after Russia subjected the land to its domination, and in Poland, not in London, New York, or Paris, continued to hope and strive for their emancipation from Russian oppression. The Irish, in spite of English oppression remained on their soil, and there were willing to be hanged for "the wearing of the green," ever challenging England's rights to govern them. The colonists (Christian and Jewish) did not run away from America on account of England's persecution, but assumed the responsibility of rebels, and at the sacrifice of life and property, finally established the American Republic. And the inhabitants thereof did not continue to call themselves

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Englishmen and take pride in English traditions or decorate their public places with King George's coat-of-arms after the separation had been effected.

We, however, while joining every group of people among whom we happened to have our being, in every effort to promote liberty, justice, love and freedom, continue to pretend to remain members of the Jewish nation, which has been out of existence for more than two thousand years. We decorate our homes and institutions with the sign of King David, to whom we would not concede today the right to rule over any group of people without their consent, and urge our co-religionists to abandon the country of their fathers and strive to establish a nation on foreign soil.

We miss no opportunity to point with pride to the fact that we are loyal citizens of the countries of our birth, that as many Jews died in defense of freedom as any others, in proportion; but we forget that Jews, like Christians, died as Americans, or Germans, or Italians, or Russians, as the case may be, and persist in claiming that they did so as Jews.

When we speak of the English nation we do not mean the Protestants or Catholics who constitute part of it; we mean the people who are natives of England. Mr. Chamberlain is an Englishman because he is a native of that country, and by the same rule of reason, Lord Reading is also an Englishman. If we should say the latter is a Jew because he is a descendant of those who constituted the Jewish nation in Palestine, then the former is not an Englishman because he may be a descendant of one of the "Twenty thousand thieves, who landed in Hastings centuries ago and founded the House of Lords."

When we speak of the French nation, we have not in

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

mind persons of a given religious affiliation or a certain complexion, but we have in mind men and women, natives of France. It is perfectly clear to every one that the French nation is composed of the people of France, except to the Jew, who indulges in every kind of sophistry for the purpose of excluding himself from the nation of which he is in fact a part. If the late Georges Clemenceau was nationally a Frenchman, even though he was notoriously an atheist, by what process of reasoning can one arrive at the conclusion that Captain Dreyfus was nationally a Jew? The latter was a native of France, saturated with French culture and trained under French military influence, without any known religious affiliations. When submitted to the test, the latter was as much a Frenchman as the former, and the claim of Jewish nationality by him or on his behalf is without foundation and contrary to fact and reason.

We have become romantic about Jewish Nationality to the extent that it represents Utopia for us. It is to be the cure for all our ills. And all this in spite of the fact that we were not born on Palestinian soil, the bones of our ancestors are not buried there, we made no sacrifices to maintain our being there, and neither we, nor our ancestors, contributed anything toward the establishment of religious or political liberty and equality in that land.

It will not do to say that we are a nation because nowhere were we permitted to live as natives. True, Jews were persecuted in Spain, in Germany, in Russia and in every other country, but they were not the only people who were denied equal rights of citizenship in the countries of their birth. The Irish have been discriminated against by the English government and, from their standpoint, have been deprived of certain rights and privileges.

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

The Russians have been oppressed by the czarist government for centuries and subjected to great burdens without corresponding benefits, but their challenge always was: "We may be yours, but the land is ours." Russia has overthrown the monarchical form of government and established a republic. Under its law all men are equal; but the Russian Jews are still being urged to turn their faces East and to continue to yearn for Palestine.

There is some sort of an assumption on the part of the Jewish people that the abandonment of Jewish nationality is tantamount to suicide because "we, in reality, are a nation no matter whether we can prove it or not." They reason that, since all other peoples constitute nations, we too should be accepted as a nation so that we may be capable of being placed somewhere among the nations of the world. Mr. Maurice Samuels, for instance, puts it this way: "We Jews have not even an address. You can address a German in Berlin, a Frenchman in Paris, an Englishman in London and an American in Washington. But where can you address a Jew?" Naively put and accepted as sound doctrine; but is it? There is no trouble in addressing Mr. Justice Brandeis at Washington as an American just as one can so address Mr. Hoover. Lord Reading, like Mr. Lloyd George, can be addressed at London as an Englishman; and Mr. Dreyfus, the Frenchman, can be reached at Paris, just as easily as Mr. Tardieu. Mr. Herbert Hoover is no less an American because his ancestors were Hollanders or Quakers than is Mr. Brandeis because his ancestors were religiously Jews. The Jews, like the Christians, do not propose that a man's nationality should be tested by the religion or place of birth of his ancestors. The nationality of a Jew should be tested by the same rules as is the nationality of any

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

other person. A New York dispatch referred to the Chicago mayor as a Czechoslovakian and the editor of the *Chicago Tribune* of July 25, 1931, says: "By nativity the mayor is linked to an old region of the old world, but he not only superficially, but essentially, is American. He is no more alien . . . than Carter Glass, Joe Robinson, Jim Reed, Roosevelt or Walsh . . . He has absorbed all the intangibles of an Endicott, Winthrop, or Bradford. If he and Charles Francis Adams sat down to discuss ways and means of getting the frigate Constitution over the water way impossibilities, and into the port of Chicago, there would be little difference in National imponderables between the man of America's oldest family and the man born in a Bohemian town."

The equality of nationality between the Bohemian and the American of the Mayflower period is no different than between Governor Henry Horner and Mr. Ford. The only difference is the mental attitude of the Jew on the subject. The Jew too should take exception to being referred to as a Jew when he is spoken of with relation to the position he is occupying in the country of his sojourn. Mr. Brandeis is no more a Jew nationally than the Chicago mayor is a Czechoslovakian.

Mr. Karl B. Bremer, in *Dynamic Emotions*, refers to Mr. Disraeli as England's alien patriot. To the Jewish mind there is nothing wrong with this designation of an Englishman as an alien, for all Jews everywhere, from their point of view, are aliens because they live in the Diaspora, that is, not in the land of their distant ancestors. Let us follow the system suggested by Kant and embody the phrase into a formula: Disraeli's distant ancestors are presumed to have been members of the Jewish nation in Jerusalem; therefore, Mr. Disraeli was an alien

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

in the country of his birth. Now let us make this formula a universal rule. Every person whose distant ancestors are presumed to have been citizens of some other country is an alien in the country of his birth. What follows? George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Abraham Lincoln and the late Theodore Roosevelt were America's alien patriots; Goethe was Germany's alien patriot; Peter the Great and Pushkin were Russia's alien patriots.

If there is a Jewish Nation it must be, in so far as the other nations are concerned, a foreign nation, and the individuals constituting this foreign nation cannot escape the designation either of foreigners or aliens wherever they chance to be. If a Jew is a native of England and nationally Jewish, he is an alien; if he establishes a permanent residence or domicile in the United States, remaining nationally Jewish, he is necessarily a foreigner. If he renounces his allegiance to any other country or nation and pledges allegiance to the American flag he *ipso facto* ceases to be Jewish and becomes American. The foregoing reasoning proves that the formula contains a falsehood. If we should say that a Jew is in Diaspora because two thousand years ago his ancestors lived in Jerusalem, we must admit that every person whose ancestors two thousand years ago lived in some other country than in which this person was born, lives in the Diaspora. Who is there living today in any country whose distant ancestors may not be safely presumed to have lived in some other country? Is there a person in America whose ancestor was not a citizen of some other country before America was discovered by Columbus? Are all the citizens of the United States living in the Diaspora? If this appears to be ridiculous, then the application of the rule to the Jews alone is downright nonsense.

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

One more test : Two thousand years ago there were one or more nations in Jerusalem whose religion was Jewish ; therefore, all the Jews living today form one nation. The formula would then be : a common religion constitutes a nation. Is it necessary to carry this any further to prove the fallacy of the rule ? Only emotionalism carried to a frenzy will enable an intelligent person to accept the Jewish idea of nationalism without granting all other religious groups the same privilege. Since that cannot be done without doing violence to fundamental principles of democracy, the reservation of the idea for ourselves alone is not in accord with reason and reality.

Let us test this in another way. Suppose there was called a conference of all nations to appear before the "Civilized Nations of the World in Council," or before the World Court or the League of Nations, to consider the subject of defining their separate rights and privileges and the establishment of boundary lines which should preserve the territory of each nation ; and Judge Julian W. Mack, for instance, should appear at this conference representing the Jewish people of America, how would he proceed to establish their claim to nationality and the right of possession of the land of Palestine ?

He would have to admit, in his petition, that he is a citizen of the United States of America and that all the people whom he represents, or on whose behalf he is appearing as a duly authorized agent or plenipotentiary, are citizens of the United States ; and that none of them have any proof admissible in any court that their ancestors came from Palestine. But he would allege that because there is supposed to exist a certain amount of social discrimination towards the Jews everywhere, manifested largely by the refusal of Gentiles to admit Jews to their

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

college fraternities and country clubs, "We Jews," he would contend, "must consider ourselves a nation without a country and we, therefore, pray that we may be declared legally a nation with the right to organize a government of our own in Palestine."

Will this make out a case? Let us see. Suppose a Booker T. Washington should appear before the same tribunal, and make the claim on behalf of the Negroes of the United States that the white people would not let their daughters marry negroes and that they would not admit a negro into their country clubs, would the court be justified in entering a judgment establishing a negro nation in America or even in Africa? Suppose a plenipotentiary of the Pope of Rome should appear before this world court, and state that at one time the Catholic church was at the head of a nation, that at this time the Protestants hate the Catholics, and in America they would not elect a Catholic to the Presidency of the United States; therefore, he would pray, Palestine, the birth-place of the ancestors of every Christian, should be set aside for the Catholics to establish themselves as a nation; would it be proper for the court to grant the prayer?

If the representatives of all nations should declare that under international law the claims of the Jews to nationhood could not be maintained, the Jews would claim that the non-Jewish opinion on the subject of nationalism is narrow and out of date because it is founded upon land, government and language and leaves out God and religion. With the modern Jew religion is out of date if it involves an omnipotent and omniscient God; culture is puerile if it does not include the preservation of ancient customs and traditions. "We," he says, "are the only true nation because we eliminate from that term land, lan-

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

guage and government; we, scattered as we are in every land, not united on any definite subject, speaking as many different languages as there are nations in the world, having no constituted authority, enjoying the rights of citizenship in every land are nevertheless the Jewish nation. Ours is the only true religion for we leave out the idea of a God who determines the course of human events, or who can reward virtue and punish sin; our God is a Jewish National God whose existence we have long admitted to be a myth. Ours is the highest and truest culture because it consists, entirely, in adoration of ancient prophets whose religion we have discarded; and in the worship of men of learning who are descendants of men who worshipped God."

What a mockery! The Jewish Spaniards actively participated in the struggle to free that nation from the domination of the church; the Jewish youth in Italy, dressed in black shirts, enthusiastically supported Il Duce in the suppression of the Catholic Action Societies; but in both countries they fail to understand that there is no difference between the contention of the Catholic Church and the alleged purpose of the Jewish leaders. In law and in reason there cannot be a division of nationality in any country without endangering the welfare of the nation, nor a union of church and state without jeopardizing the liberty of the inhabitants.

The Spanish constitution declares that "Spain is a Democratic Republic . . . organized as a regime of liberty and justice . . . all Spaniards are equal before the law . . . The Spanish State has no official religion." The Jewish Spaniards have helped to frame this constitution, but the Jewish Nationalists would have the Spanish people believe that the Jews are not Spaniards. Spaniards are defined

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

in the constitution to be those born of Spanish parents; or those born in Spanish territory of foreign parents if they choose Spanish Nationality in the form determined by law, and foreigners who obtain nationalization. Is there Jewish Nationality of any person in Spain within the terms of the Spanish constitution? To make it impossible for any person to be discriminated against, the constitution declares that race, descent, sex, social class, wealth, political ideas or religious beliefs shall not be considered the basis of privilege in public law. Is a person of the Jewish faith born in Spain of parents who have also been born in that country a Spaniard? For the purpose of enjoying the rights and privileges conferred upon every Spaniard, the answer would be yes, but for the purpose of "forever preserving the identity of the Jewish people," the answer must be no. The constitution provides that "Every Spaniard may move freely within national territory" . . . If a Jew is not a Spaniard he may not move freely; only Spanish citizens are eligible to be elected to the presidency . . . If a Jew is not a Spaniard and chooses to aspire to the office of president in Spain, will he be able to point out the difference between citizenship and nationality, which will be recognized by any court? Members of religious orders are not eligible to the office of president of that republic. What under this constitutional provision is the status of a member of the Zionist organization?

There is no law in any civilized country which fixes the status of a citizen on the basis of his religious opinion or racial antecedents, even though the Hitlerites threaten to bar Jews from receiving equal rights under the law. This threat is induced by the Jewish National attitude rather than by their religious faith. The legalistic philosophy of human equality is predicated upon the proposition

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

that the rights of every nation, individual or group of individuals, must be determined by the same rule of law, and in every nation every citizen should be accorded equal rights with every other citizen to enjoy the privileges and immunities accorded under the law. To follow a different rule of law with regard to Jews, whether chosen by themselves or imposed by others, is a violation of the fundamental rights of man. If in any land some people advocate legislation which would discriminate between Jew and non-Jew, it is no justification for any Jew to at once read himself out of the nation and become nationally Jewish, without at once leaving the country which threatens such discriminations. Because here and there Hitlerism makes its appearance, Jewry arrives at the conclusion that the Gentiles will never accord them equality before the law and therefore, "A Jew must remain a Jew forever." By his birth certificate every Jew in Germany can readily prove in any court that he is a German, but not even a Philadelphia lawyer could prove that any alleged Jew in Germany, or in any other land, is a Jew, unless he could establish the fact that the person in question believes in God and observes the Torah. As in Poland, the Jew in Germany and in every other land is convinced that religiously he can adopt any faith, while racially and nationally he can remain a Jew. Test this Jewish attitude by a general or universal rule. Try to find any person, or group of persons, who could maintain and defend religion sans God, race without regard to color or physiognomy, nationality without land, language or civil government.

Mr. Ludwig Lewisohn in *Israel*, speaking of the Jews in America, says, "In America the Jew is regarded with suspicion; he is tolerated; he is reproved; he is questioned. He is blamed for being himself, which is precisely

what, in America, he ought to have had a chance to be. The stupid old myth of Jewish conspiracies is whispered about. The most pacific and unorganized of peoples becomes an object of fear—the step from fear to hate is short. We are Jews and can be nothing else and thus it is as Jews we must make our contribution to American civilization.” Of course, we must be feared and eventually hated if we persist in absorbing everything America offers us and yet refuse to become Americans just as we have always refused to become Russians or Poles.

By what right does a man, born in America of American parents, claim to be anything else nationally but American? And why should a Jew assert his desire to contribute to American civilization as a Jew rather than as an American? Secure under the protection of the American armies, schooled in institutions established and maintained by the American government, inspired by the words and deeds of American statesmen, and yet just “American Jews contributing to our American civilization as Jews”—how can such a position be defended before mankind and what kind of a verdict can we expect? What do we expect to contribute to American civilization as Jews? Do we expect to contribute to America the religion that we have ourselves abandoned? Do we expect to strengthen the American nation by teaching adherence to ancestral nationality? To what extent would American civilization be benefited by a universal acceptance of the Jewish idea of race, nationality or religion?

Mr. Lewisohn proclaims that “Assimilation is impossible because the Jew cannot change his nationality or his national character.” What is Jewish nationality and what is “Jewish national character”? In what nation did the Jew acquire a Jewish national character? In Russia,

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

Germany, or Spain? What is in that character which the Jew cannot change? Surely Mr. Lewisohn does not mean the popularly considered Jewish characteristics consisting of hand gestures, the love for herring and gefilte fish; the charging of excessive interest or the preference for the clothing trade. These are purely personal dispositions found in every ghetto group but rapidly disappearing. It would be arguing the obvious to say that there are non-Jews in France and Italy who are addicted to the same hand gestures, and Christians everywhere who love herring and charge usurious interest.

There is an impression among Jewry that any disposition on the part of a Jew to assert other than Jewish nationalism is evidence of cowardice and involves disloyalty. It is a common expression among them that the assumption of a name which conceals Jewish origin is a denial of nationality and deserving of general condemnation. Even a Gentile does not hesitate to charge a person who changes his name from Goldstein to Gould with denying his nationality. A Pole in America finds no difficulty in declaring that he is an American of Polish descent. A German in America will unhesitatingly state that he is an American and does not believe in hyphenated Americanism, but when a Jew says, "I am an American," he has a disturbing sensation in his conscience and considers himself called upon to make explanations. And yet, changing national allegiance has been a process through which mankind has been passing since the dawn of civilization. Without taking note of ancient history the record of the last 200 years shows how common this experience has been.

In 1770 the people who occupied the territory which eventually became the United States of America, loved

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

their King George and were loyal to the English flag; five years later England became an enemy country, King George an object of contempt, and the loyalty to the Union Jack was completely transferred to the stars and stripes and the Englishmen became Americans. In 1890 the people occupying Cuba loved their Spanish king as the Jews loved King David, and they were ready to die in defense of the Spanish flag. In 1898 Spain became an enemy country, the Spanish king an object of hatred, the love and loyalty for the "mother" country was wholeheartedly transferred to the flag of the Cuban Republic, and those who theretofore were Spaniards at once became Cubans. Prior to the world war the people of Turkey were primarily Mussulmen, and there existed a religious bond between them and the Mussulmen in every other country. The loyalty of a Turk was to his fellow-coreligionists rather than to his government. Since the great war the Turks have conceived the idea that they ought to rid themselves of traditional sloth, superstition, and fanaticism, and become a civilized nation. Kemal Pasha thought that the high culture of America was sufficient answer to the skeptical belief that the culture of people is imbedded in their character, that it takes generations to change them. He concluded that environment, not hereditary influence, is the basis of civilization and culture. By changing the environment, both physically and culturally, the modernization of Turkey could be achieved. National cultural and racial loyalties and characteristics—American, Spanish, Turkish or Jewish—continue to shift according to the change of environment, all contention to the contrary by the Jews notwithstanding. In some countries the shifting of loyalties has progressed in one direction, in some, in another direction, but no-

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

where did the Jew remain outside of the course of events, nor did he escape the influence of changed environment, except where he remained within his cocoon of superstition, buried in his book, and unconcerned with the great changes that were going on all around him.

It is a truism, says, Mr. Radin, that a people are what the country they live in makes them. Its position on the surface of the earth, its physical features, its distribution of land and water, its rocks and its soil and the things dug therefrom or planted therein, the winds that blow over it—"all these are vitally necessary, if we wish to understand what manner of men dwelt in the country, what they were able to accomplish, and what things were denied them." Mr. Lewisohn would have us believe that the Jewish character, developed in Palestine 3000 years ago, remained the same even though every country on earth since then has been the cradle, the school, and the battlefield of all the Jews.

Jewish nationhood, based on either Jewish religion or a distinct Jewish race, leads Dr. Gerson B. Levi, of Chicago, to say: "The one item that the Zionists have forgotten so far, and which really is immutable, is that there are Arabs and Jews and Christians in Palestine and that there always will be, and that bloodshed will be avoided only if there is equal justice for all of them. The mandate guarantees that. It guarantees the Arabs in the possession of their property and it limits the extent of immigration. The Jewish state in Palestine vanishes. A Palestinian state or colony under the British mandate there may be—but a Jewish state, no.

"In other words, Palestine is not to be an ethnic nationality. That was one particular thing that some of us non-Zionists dreaded most. It was the idea of the ethnic

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

nationality that made for the persecutions in the lands of the old world. It is the recurrence of the idea of the ethnic nationality that has brought about the rise of Hitler and Hitlerism in Germany. To that we Jews have been protesting. But the advocacy of the Jewish state in Palestine was a surrender of the right to protest. We argue against ethnic nationalism when we are the sufferers, and when we are given a land we join the ranks of the ethnic nationalists. Personally we always felt that the gain was too small for the price that we would have to pay for it. We are on principles opposed to the whole theory of ethnic nationalism. Palestine, if anything happens to it to change its present conditions, should be a land like Switzerland. It is not a German national homeland or a French national homeland or an Italian national homeland. It is Switzerland in which many different peoples live in harmony."

America is like Switzerland; many different peoples live here in harmony, but it is none the less America upon whose soil the American Nation, including Jews, Christians and non-believers, Nordics, Teutons, Blacks, Browns, and Whites, has its being, neither group possessing authority or power to exclude any other group from the enjoyment of the blessings of liberty and equality before the law. England, Germany, France, and Russia, in the final analysis, will be found to be no different than America or Switzerland, with the possible exception that the co-mingling of different peoples in these countries dates a little farther back; but age does not alter the principle that ethnic nationality is obnoxious to human freedom, peace, and happiness.

One more test of the Jewish national concept and we may be done with the subject. If a people be designated

THE JEWISH NATIONAL COMPLEX

as being without a country, the individuals comprising this people would be men without a country. If the Jews are a nation without a country, then every Jew is a person without a country. The League of Nations has evolved a plan which enables it to issue so-called Nanssen passes to people without a country. Such passes, for instance, are carried by Russians who have left that country after the revolution. They elect not to affiliate themselves with any other nation, but to remain Russians in Diaspora, hoping that sooner or later a Messiah will re-establish for them a government in Russia in accord with their ancient traditions.

Suppose that the Congress of the United States and the League of Nations should seriously accept our Jewish nationalism with all its implications, and should attempt to provide that every Jew desiring to travel in foreign lands should do so on a Nanssen Pass, regardless of his citizenship or nativity. What would be the reaction of native American Jews? Would they acquiesce in such regulation or would they insist that as Americans they should be allowed to travel on passports issued by the American government? The most superficial thought on this question will prove that Jewish nationhood is what Professor Einstein said about race: a humbug. Jewish nationhood in its final analysis means that even though the human family is divided into separate nations with diversified languages and cultures, the Jews constitute a nation whose members are not confined to any given territory or any particular language or culture.

This notion is no different than would be a notion that all Protestants constitute a nation, because they are to be found in every country speaking different languages, but practicing one religion. The Jews like some Turks cling

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

to a traditional nationalism which is and always has been a hindrance to human freedom.

In spite of the reforms in Turkey there still are groups of people who will not accept Turkish nationalism as a fact, but persist in an effort to cling to traditional nationalism like the Jews. A glance at one of these groups will show us how perfectly foolish we really are. The Manchester Guardian reports that the trouble-makers in Turkey are the Dancing Dervishers who in the past have become a sort of religious-political aristocracy. In the last analysis their struggle is to bring Turkey back to an Asiatic life again and to get rid of Western influence. They believe that they are more perfect than the ordinary Moslem, and that they hold a more perfect law by which the whole of society ought to be governed. It is not for faith and worship that they are organizing, but for the Moslem Law of the Sheriat—unsuited as it is to modern times. The Dervish movement is an attempt to bring Turkey back to social forms of six or seven centuries ago. "It is they who, for their own interest, help to keep up the false notion that Angora is against religion. What the government is determined to fight to the death, and what the Dervish orders are trying to establish, is medieval theocracy, together with many superstitious observances and limited notions of the past."

Our national claim is actuated by the same motives as are the claims of the Dervishers: We, too, would have people believe that we are part of an ancient aristocracy, that our laws are best suited to the government of society, and that civilization should turn back twenty centuries and reestablish a form of government that will be based on ancient notions, ancient beliefs and customs and tradition unsuited to modern times.

CHAPTER IX

MISTAKES OF ISRAEL

*"Forever live, I hear an echo,
Removed from earth, remote from sky;
And strange alike to man and angel,
You dare not live, you shall not die."*¹

CENTURIES of "Jewish Life" have left Israel with the impression that all the disadvantages under which he finds himself have been imposed upon him by the Gentiles. Even a cursory reading of history demonstrates that he built his own ghettos within which he chose to carry on an existence in conformity with his Torah; although later he was prohibited from leaving the prison so built by himself. For 5000 years, within the ghetto walls in every land, buried within his legends and myths, Israel has been waiting, praying and hoping for relief from heaven, while with other peoples he planned, conspired, if you will, rebelled and fought against oppression and persecution, for liberty and freedom. His whole life, in the ghetto, while devoted to the study and observance of the Torah, has been spent in the expectation of gifts to be bestowed upon him by others. He has been persuaded by his prophets that God created for Israel the Garden of Eden from which He finally drove him out because he tasted of the Tree of Knowledge. God had promised Abraham a land upon which He would raise kings, priests and prophets; Moses had led him out of bondage and gave him a code of laws; for centuries Israel has been telling himself the story about somebody carry-

¹*Raskin's: You Comfort Me.*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

ing his people as captives into Babylon and somebody else bringing them back to their promised land. From Balfour, we accept the "Declaration" not in the spirit in which the English obtained their rights from King John but as a gift bestowed by a magnanimous monarch; and from England, the Master, as mendicants we expect protection in the enjoyment of its generosity.

From Elijah, Israel expects answers to all his perplexing questions and problems; from the Gentiles, Israel expects the privilege of admission into their social clubs and exclusive hotels, and of Messiah he has been expecting the liberation from exile. Napoleon was not far from the truth when, finding the Jews mourning at a Synagogue for their lost land, he said "why don't they arise and fight for it?" It is this habit of praying and hoping for God-given favors that has every Jew in a fever of excitement about the establishment of a Jewish National Homeland in Palestine by means of charitable contribution aided by the kind disposition of the British government.

If every Jew should realize the folly of this attitude, he would at once learn that his country is the land of his birth and for that land, and that land alone, he should be ready to sacrifice his life, his property and his sacred honor. The Jew is mistaken when he starts out with the assumption that the country where he was born belongs to the Gentiles and that his rights depend upon Gentile generosity or tolerance. It is much nobler for a Jew in England to say "I am an Englishman" than it is for him to say that he is a Jew.

When a Jew like Maurice Samuel discards the Bible as the word of God, and maintains that "We and God grew up together . . . We have a national God . . . We believe that God is a Jew, that there is no English or

MISTAKES OF ISRAEL

American God," he is repeating in the 20th century the language of the Puritans in the 17th century when they claimed that they "are a chosen race . . . God hath sifted a whole nation, that he might send choice grain into this wilderness. We are as a city set upon a hill, in the open view of all the earth, the eyes of the world are upon us, because we profess ourselves to be a people in covenant with God."

The Jew is mistaken when through the same author, he tells the Gentiles "Our gloomy monotheism . . . is the eternal enemy of your God . . . you are bullies, cowards, and mobs, when set side by side with us . . ." If this is the sentiment of Jews generally, we cannot expect anything at the hands of the Gentiles except prejudice and hatred. It is astonishing how intelligent Jews can fail to realize the damage to a people that follows the declaration: "We have taken on your garb, speak your language, and look like you; share your countries and institutions, but the Jew still stands apart from the Gentile world, and his effective contribution to its life is disastrously different . . . in arts we have been second rate, but we have produced an overwhelming number of revolutionists and socialists and iconoclasts . . . We have, in science, belles-lettres, and the plastic arts, been a thoroughly minor people . . . We, the destroyers will remain destroyers forever . . . Nothing you will do will meet our needs and demands. We will forever destroy because we need a world of our own . . ."²

What a calumny against the individual Jews in every land who are so conspicuously contributing towards peace and progress! A charge of this sort by a non-Jew against the Jewish people would provoke the B'nai Brith into a

²*Maurice Samuel: You Gentiles.*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

tantrum, and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise would immediately call a conference of his co-workers and probably institute an action for defamation of character. No Jew would admit that in return for the Gentile's garb, language, and country, the Jew's contribution was "disastrously different", or that our contribution to modern civilization consists of "revolutionists, socialists, and iconoclasts" or that no matter how far the Gentiles may go in granting us equality, we will remain "destroyers" and if the Gentiles want a world within which to live, they must forever guard against our efforts to "destroy."

The most serious blunder of the Jews is their assumption that they have been preserved as a nation or a people. They never were a united nation, and were no more preserved as a people than the Seventh Day Adventists. "All through the period of the conquest of Canaan and of the Judges," says Rabbi Samuel S. Cohon, a professor in a Hebrew college, "the tribes maintained their separateness, absorbed in their own needs and jealous of their own prerogative; they refused to unite even in time of distress. Following the expensive splendor of Solomon's reign, Israel separated from Judah. A spirit of hostility filled the two rival kingdoms until the year 721 B. C., when Israel was destroyed by Assyria and Judah alone survived."

Jews were not one nation when they inhabited one country and had their kings and prophets; they certainly cannot be said to have survived as a nation scattered though they be without any substantial elements to hold them together. The Seventh Day Adventists have not preserved as a nation, even if there be a lot of them; the Protestants, although found everywhere, have not been preserved as a nation or a people; the redheads, no matter

MISTAKES OF ISRAEL

how numerous they may be or how different they may appear from the rest of the human race, have not been preserved as a people. Like any other religious group, Jews have continued for centuries in every land to practice their particular cult but never as a united body of men and women.

Both, Jews and Gentiles, are mistaken when they say that the Jews possess rare genius. "In spite of the popular delusion to the contrary," says Mr. Samuel, "there are hardly any Jews among the world's wealthiest men. The greatest financial institutions, as well as the world's greatest businesses, are almost exclusively non-Jewish."

When the Jews talk about oppression they are mistaken in assuming that they have been the only oppressed people on earth. As late as 1860 there were over 23,000,000 Christian peasants in Russia in abject slavery, while the Jews of that period in Russia followed their trades and professions, enjoying reasonable freedom and prosperity consistent with the form of government and general economic conditions prevalent at that time.

In 1932 Spain banished thousands of Jesuits from the land and hundreds of churches have been appropriated by the state; in the same year hundreds of Orthodox Jews in Jerusalem made an assault upon Jews who engaged in a football game on the Sabbath and many were seriously injured and many were arrested by the British police. Then, look at India! In May of the same year 64 were killed and over 600 injured in a battle between Hindus and Moslems. Hindu mobs looted Moslem shops, and temples and mosques were burned indiscriminately. Thus do religious groups oppress and persecute other religious groups, and Jews are no exception.

In the early part of the seventeenth century a religious

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

group known as Pilgrims were forced to abandon their native England on account of their religious views, and became self-exiled inhabitants of Holland. In 1620 this band boarded the Mayflower and after a stormy ocean voyage they finally landed in the new world, America. Analyzing their situation in the light of the experience of Israel, is there any real difference between their descendants and the descendants of any Jew who had in the same manner sought a haven where he might worship his God?

There is one word in the English language that is being used in a certain sense only with reference to Jews; that word is assimilation. Everywhere one can hear, "Shall we assimilate? Will the Jews ever become assimilated? Will assimilation help or hinder the Jewish people? Is it desirable from the Jewish point of view, and what will be the effect of assimilation upon the rest of the world?" One never hears the Nordics or Teutons talking about assimilation between them; the Swede never worries about his being assimilated by the Norwegians; and the Catholic would become bewildered if one should ask, "How about a little Catholic assimilation?" The average Jew is mistaken if he thinks that assimilation consists in intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles. Assimilation is accomplished whenever a Jew takes on Gentile garb, speaks Gentile language, shares in the Gentile countries and institutions. He may think that he stands apart from the Gentile world, he may talk against intermarriage, but nevertheless, as soon as he gets away from the restrictions in his Torah he becomes completely assimilated.

Even our claim that the Jews are and always have been wanderers is not based upon any competent evidence. Of course, we find Jews everywhere but we are not at all justified to conclude that a Jew in Africa is a descendant

MISTAKES OF ISRAEL

of one of the lost tribes without any concern to know whether these lost tribes were all blacks, browns, or yellows. A Jew in Germany has not wandered any farther than a Christian in Germany; and that is true of any man in any country no matter what his religion may be. The charge that the Jew is a wanderer is a slander and an insult even though we have accepted it as the truth.

Any Jew will tell you that if we had not written the Bible there would have been no civilization; that all the wisdom of the world is derived from the Torah and every philosophy is founded upon the fundamental principles contained in the Talmud. This is a false notion that would provoke our unqualified derision if asserted by any other group. The most casual observation proves the fallacy of it all. Hammurabi, a Babylonian, one thousand years before Moses, formulated a code of laws which provided the world with a workable system of ethics. Canaan was a great commercial nation when the Jews are said to have been wandering through the wilderness; and Egypt was a civilized nation with a government and a culture long before "God made His covenant with Abraham." Virgil and Homer wrote great epics long before Disraeli was prime minister of England, and Greek drama antedates the writing of the Torah and the poetry of Solomon.

Even conceding that the Bible contains some wisdom, its effect upon those who followed it was not productive of great achievements; and if there is any wisdom in the Talmud, no one today concerns himself with it. But if the Jews gave the Bible to the world, the ancient Hebrews also gave humanity the idea of a political society organized on a theocratic pattern with priests and prophets administering the divine laws in the government of human life and relations. To thinking men in all ages it was

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

apparent that such a system of government would never be conducive to human freedom and happiness. After more than 2000 years of sacrifices of human life, church and state have been divorced in nearly every country on earth; theocratic government has been smashed forever and "all the King's horses and all the King's men" can never put that monster together again.

The average Jew will tell you that the Jews, having once produced a great culture, could repeat that feat if given an opportunity in their "own land". This is another error. There are more Jews in New York today than were ever concentrated in any given place, but no Jewish culture has come out of New York. Go through the district occupied by those who show the most Jewishness and you find no particular culture. The culture of a Jewish ghetto is no different than is the culture of a Polish, Swedish, or Italian ghetto. All you find there is what was prevalent a thousand years ago: poverty, ignorance, and superstition. There is no hope or danger of the Jews producing any kind of culture which will envelop the rest of mankind, or all the Jews for that matter. We are like drops of water in the human stream; we can only move with the stream and not against it.

One of the most common errors is the desire of Jews to restore the Hebrew language because it was the language of the prophets and psalmists. What would we say if we heard that the Catholics of the world proposed to establish or restore the Latin language as the language of the countries under their control? Do we not know that great literature has been written in languages other than Hebrew? What about Plato and Aristotle, Shakespeare and Milton, Schopenhauer and Heine? Pushkin and Gogol, and even Zangwill and Wasserman?

MISTAKES OF ISRAEL

If the Hebrew language had been the language of our ancestors and we chose to speak it, there could be some justification for the ambition to restore it; but our ancestors did not speak that language at all, and we do not seek to speak it ourselves. What we propose to do is to teach it to others, who, like ourselves, must, in their intercourse with their fellow men, use the language of their native lands. The adoration of the Hebrew language is like the reverence for other ancient traditions.

Mahatma Gandhi is quoted as saying: "Cow protection is an article of faith in Hinduism. Apart from its religious sanctity, it is an ennobling creed. Cow protection is the dearest possession of the Hindu heart. It is the one concrete belief common to all Hindus. No one who does not believe in cow protection can possibly be a Hindu. Cow protection is the gift of Hindus to the world. And Hinduism will live so long as there are Hindus to protect the Cow. The way to protect (her) is to die for her." Jews and Christians laugh at such bigotry, but listen to the echo: "I cannot help repeating," writes Mr. Ludwig Lewisohn, "that the Jew must adhere closely to the old world of his. It is the duty and the necessity of every Jew to remember his traditions and his customs and never to surrender them—at any price. The new world may entice him, but he must never yield to it; instead he must always live as a part of the past to which he inevitably belongs . . . Once the Jew surrenders his traditions and his customs and substitutes the habits and customs of his Christian neighbor, the Jewish race is doomed . . . I am well aware of the fact that the Jew will continue to suffer for a long while—because he is different, he is in the minority, he is sensitive, he is in an alien environment. But it is his duty to remain different; and it is his duty to suffer."

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Compare the relative values of the cow and the Jewish customs and traditions. Do the Lewisohns observe the Jewish customs of Sabbath, earlocks, and abstain from eating the swine? Are we ready to die in defense of the customs of burning the witch or stoning the woman who had sinned, or preserving the religion of our fathers? Are the Lewisohns preserving the traditions of excommunicating a person who is discovered carrying a handkerchief on the Sabbath? If there is no beefsteak for the Gandhi's, is there no bacon for the Lewisohns? Just how far do the Lewisohns go in adhering to the old world? Are we not mistaken when we assume that we must continue to suffer as long as we are different and that we must remain different even at the cost of peace and happiness?

The general clamor to restore the ancient glory of Israel is due to our refusal to understand the realities of the past and the present. Nobody wants to go back to the glorious periods of kings and popes; no one would dream of returning to old customs or even old languages. King David is as dead as King Tut. Solomon's temple is buried in the debris of three thousand years and the palaces of the Romanoffs are used as havens for Russian children. Torquemada has been long ago relegated into oblivion and all the instruments of the Inquisition have been made into pruning knives. The Neros fiddle no longer while their cities are on fire, and the people have abandoned the promotion of bandits to thrones. The Simon Legrees are mourning at the tombs of slavery and men are no longer crucified for teaching the truth. Witches are permitted to live and scientists are no longer burned at the stake. We have become thoroughly acclimated to a western civilization and, in the intercourse

MISTAKES OF ISRAEL

with our neighbors, do not act as people acted even in the eighteenth century, A. D., let alone the fifth century, B. C.

Our morality during business hours is the same as the morality of the non-Jews. We, like they, strive to reduce cost of production and increase sales price; we try to reduce our taxes and increase rents; we want to buy as cheaply and sell as dearly as do the Christians and they do not vie with us in the reduction of interest rates.

Do we want to go back to the time when the prophets preached, "Ye shall love thy neighbor as thyself?" More than thirty centuries of preaching has demonstrated that humanity will not take to this religious principle any more than it has taken to the doctrine "Forgive thy enemies," and one certainly cannot love his neighbor as himself as long as one considers himself a different human being from his neighbor.

If there is anything that we want to go back to, or re-establish, what is there that prevents us from accomplishing the desired end? People with specific cultural aspirations have tried to promote them in the past, and we can try now if we have any real such aspirations. The DUCHOBORTZI in Russia carried out their schemes even in the face of monarchical opposition. A group of people in America have succeeded in establishing themselves at Benton Harbor, Michigan, as the Israelites, with a King David and all the rigamarole of religious entity. If nothing has come out of their group life after forty years of existence except scandal, it is because that is all group life ever produced.

Another group of people under the leadership of the late John Alexander Dowie, obsessed with the idea that they have discovered the only true religion and mode of

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

life, acquired a tract of land north of Chicago and there established the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church in the City of Zion. Tobacco, whiskey and profane language have been tabooed for more than two score years; the people still believe that the earth is flat and that every modern discovery is the work of the devil. If nothing so far has come out of Zion except ignorance and superstition, it only proves that nothing can ever come out of Zion if its life is cramped with old traditions and ancient beliefs.

If we are in earnest in our clamor for the restoration of Jewish culture, let us try it in the United States where there is an abundance of land and plenty of Jews. There is nothing to prevent those rabbis and politicians, who speak so loudly about American Jewry, from acquiring a large tract of land and establishing themselves as a Jewish group with all the religious customs and traditions fully revived, including the rebuilding of the Temple of Solomon and the selection of a King David. At the entrance to the colony they could erect a sign: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." At another entrance they could have a poster teaching the people: "Thou shalt keep the Sabbath day holy and on that day ye shall do no manner of work." "Ye shall not suffer a witch to live." All the rest of the laws of Moses could be published on the fences and walls so that those who run could freely read. If the suggestion seems ludicrous it is because all our claims are insincere. If it should be suggested that we can establish the Judaism of Spinoza and Einstein in place of the old rabbinical Judaism, then the question arises, what is this new Judaism and where can it flourish to the best advantage? Palestine or Jerusalem never pro-

MISTAKES OF ISRAEL

duced an Einstein nor did any place where the Jews were congregated in ghettos ever produce a Spinoza. These geniuses blossomed forth in the open spaces and never would have come into being if they had depended on what was taught in Cheders and Yeshivahs.

Practically every Jew in every land is obsessed with the notion that the Gentiles do not want him and would not associate with him in any manner. Even in the United States, no matter to what position a Jew is elevated, he retains the feeling that he is only being tolerated. There is no basis for this notion, except as the exclusiveness is being nurtured by ourselves. Jews never invite Gentiles to their homes; they never visit or offer to visit their Gentile neighbors, and they continually agitate the subject of differences presumed to exist between the two groups. By our sensitiveness we make the Gentile uncomfortable in our presence, and by our consciousness of being Jews we are uncomfortable in the presence of a Gentile. All of this is due not at all to the existence of any antipathy, but entirely to the ghetto spirit that still persists within us. The remedy for this condition lies within us; we should make some earnest effort to rid ourselves of the habits and thoughts of the 18th century and meet our Gentile friends on the basis of truth and fellowship.

We are all wrong if we think that our security depends upon Gentile tolerance of our shallow pride and pretenses to distinction on account of ancestry. We are mistaken if we assume that we can socially adjust ourselves to modern life in any land without cutting the Gordian knot which ties us to ancient beliefs and traditions. We should examine our religion and compare it with that of our neighbor; if we find no material difference, then we should be willing to admit that we are not Jews and our neigh-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

bors are not Gentiles, and this will bring us closer together and enable us to arrive at a clearer understanding of the elements involved in the Jewish problem.

The Jews are perfectly satisfied with being citizens of the country of their birth and to live under the same conditions as their fellow citizens. But what they lack is courage to face the truth. Let us ring down the curtain on the past and realize our true status. With the realization of the progress made by the human family from the protoplasm to the Prime Minister, comes the understanding that any claim to superiority by a group of people is a fraud and the admission by men of an error is the greatest virtue. Without regard to what the non-Jews should do or not do, let us gather enough courage to admit that we are wrong in our claim that we are a chosen people, thus emancipating ourselves from the self-imposed yoke of Jewish raciality; let us for once realize that it is far more important to know where humanity is going than whence it came.

By an examination of our religious opinions and by comparison of it with those of our fathers, who were Jews because they believed in God and followed the laws of Moses, we must come to the conclusion, if we are honest with ourselves, that we are not Jews because of our religion; and thus the second wing of the trinity is cast upon the scrap heap. There remains only one wing; that of nationality. Is it possible that we can overlook the fact that this claim is not only without merit, but is absolutely abominable?

How can the Jewish problem be solved? With Zionism? Decidedly not. By Jews becoming Christians? Not at all. You can no longer obtain any baptism in that bowl, for it is as dry as the Sahara. By intermarriage? No,

MISTAKES OF ISRAEL

that process is going on without regard to the effect that it will have on the Jews or Gentiles. The problem can be solved by ourselves understanding the ordinary meaning of words which we employ. We must realize that nothing can be accounted for by giving it a name, or the thing itself be understood by merely uttering the name. The words, "Jews," "Way of Life," "Jewish Traditions," "Jewish Culture," "Jewish race or nationality," have no more real meanings to a Jew than the terms "Higher Life," "Christian Virtue," "Jeffersonian Democracy," have to the average man. You do not solve the problems involved in these terms by the use of the terms.

If we could understand that the term Jew means a person who has a certain religious belief and has nothing to do with the race or nationality of the person, we could remove the ambiguity in the term. If we would demand an explanation of the word "tradition" we would soon learn that the person using it does not know what he is talking about. If we should learn what the terms "nation" and "nationality" mean, we would have no trouble in orientating ourselves and taking our place exactly where we belong, and we and our Gentile friends would soon know that the opprobrious designation of vagabond or stranger cannot be applied to any of us. If all of these terms were given ordinary interpretations there would be nothing left about which we could quarrel among ourselves or with other people. Let us quit challenging the world unless we can present an issue before the bar of mankind which can be intelligently considered and upon which a sound judgment can be rendered.

At 11 o'clock on the 11th of November, 1918, the German and the French soldiers leaped out of their trenches exchanging cigarettes and fraternizing upon the soil sat-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

urated with the blood of their comrades who were murdered in a war of misunderstanding. They were even unconcerned about the terms of peace. Catholics, Protestants, Baptists and Jews of today are not conscious of the differences and misunderstandings that caused so much injustice and suffering in the past; from a religious standpoint an era of peace and fraternity does exist in spite of the refusal by priests and rabbis to recognize it.

Let us quit the cry about the Gentile calling us Jews; about the antipathy of Gentiles towards Jews everywhere; about native Russians, Germans, Englishmen and Americans of the Jewish faith being men and women without a country; and about their being vagabonds in their native lands. Let us form a catechism for ourselves and answer every question according to the truth as sustained by the visible evidence.

Two thousand, or twenty thousand years ago, one is as likely as the other, prophets arose and convinced a lot of people, hungry for salvation, that some one had a conversation with the Creator of the universe, and arranged that all those who join a particular cult shall be the chosen people and shall be the ones whom the Creator will prefer to all others; and He would make of them a great nation and give them and their generations to come, all the land to the south, the west, the east and the north, for an everlasting occupation. People with timid souls and in search of favor flocked to this cult. This chosen people idea spread in every direction until, like the wild der-vishes, the believers started wars for possession of the land which they thought was occupied by unbelievers, with the result that they founded a nation with all the murders, assassination, and oppression peculiar to all kings and kingdoms from time immemorial. "The Jew

MISTAKES OF ISRAEL

lived," says Bernard Lazare, "under the rule of the Lord, Yahveh—and he knew but one thing, the law, i. e., the collection of rules and decrees which it had once pleased Yahveh to give Moses—a law divine and excellent, made to lead its followers to eternal bliss; a perfect law which the Jewish people alone had received. With such an idea of the Torah, the Jew could not accept the laws of strange nations; nor could he think of submitting to them; he could not abandon the divine laws, externally good and just, to follow human laws. The laws attached to the people—there were religious obligations binding upon all Jews, who, by an ancient covenant with God, had undertaken to fulfill them."

As a result of this mental and spiritual attitude of the Jews up to a hundred years ago, they originated and promoted the inequality which existed between them and the people among whom they lived. "At Rome, at Alexandria, at Antioch, in Cyrenaica," continues Mr. Lazare, "they were allowed full freedom—They were not required to appear in court on Saturday; they were even permitted to have their own special tribunals, and were not amenable to the laws of the empire; they enjoyed complete self-government; . . . They had their own chiefs, their own senate, and were not subject to the general municipal authorities. Thus Israel's attachment to its laws was one of the first causes of its unpopularity; whether because it derived from that law benefits and advantages which were apt to excite envy, or because it prided itself upon the excellence of its Torah and considered itself above and beyond other peoples."

The Jewish people in the effort to solve its problems must ascertain the extent it has traveled from the Judaism of the past. Jewry must decide whether it will continue

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

in its present course of progress or return to ancient traditions. In this age when, in the language of Professor Einstein, the Jew is no longer "separated from the Gentile by barriers of religious traditions, secular forms of life and legal restrictions; when he is no longer confined in his spiritual development to his own literature and together with the Christians he is undergoing a common development on common ground under the influence of the same factors" it behooves Israel to pause and determine whither his emancipation from oppression on one hand and religious narrowness on the other has carried him, and what vital and positive forces in Jewish life can or should be preserved and maintained.

If we are willing to admit that Jews in East European countries have been granted full rights of citizenship and that officially and legally they are now full fledged citizens in almost every country of the world, what is there that Jewry could demand from the peoples of the world which could be granted through legal channels?

CHAPTER X

THE ANSWER

*Start where you stand and never mind the past,
The past won't help you in beginning anew,
If you have left it all behind at last
Why, that's enough, you are done with it,
You are through.*

*This is another chapter in the book,
This is another race that you have planned,
Don't give the vanished days a backward look,
Start where you stand.*

*What has been, has been; yesterday is dead
And by it you are neither blessed nor damned,
Take courage, man, be brave and drive ahead,
Start where you stand.*

BERTON BRADLEY.

VOLTAIRE, having been accused of being a Jew hater, addressed a series of letters to the Jewish people, in the last one he said: "We have been accustomed for ages to hang you up between two dogs; we have repeatedly driven you away through avarice; we have recalled you through avarice and stupidity; we still, in more towns than one, make you pay for liberty to breathe the air; . . . All the difference is, that our priests, content with applying your money to their own use, have had you burned by laymen; while your priests always immolated the human victims with their own sacred hands. You were monsters of cruelty and fanaticism in

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Palestine; we have been so in Europe: my friends, let all this be forgotten."

Martin Luther in a letter to Leo X charged that "For many years now, nothing else has overflowed from Rome into the world than the laying waste of goods, of bodies, and of souls . . . the church of Rome has become the most lawless den of thieves, the very kingdom of sin, death and hell." Isaiah cried to the Lord, charging Israel with being "a sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that deal corruptly; they have forsaken the Lord, they have condemned the Holy one of Israel . . . the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint: from the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it" (Isaiah I), Zechariah, Jeremiah, John Huss, Spinoza and the other martyrs, who have had the courage to speak the truth, are the witnesses by whom the charges in the indictments above set forth have been proven beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty. But, as Luther said, the ears of our generation have been made so delicate by the senseless multitude of flatterers that, as soon as we perceive that anything of ours is not approved of, we cry out that we are being bitterly assailed; and when we can repel the truth by no other pretense, we escape by attributing bitterness, impatience, intemperance, to our adversaries.

The comparative religious freedom and political equality which prevails today is not due to a recognition of the things advocated by priests and prophets of old but to the capacity of men to forget the wrongs inflicted by one people full of monstrous cruelty upon another people possessed of the same attributes. Both Jew and Gentile should turn their vision from the Jew who for centuries had prayed for the coming of the Messiah and from the

THE ANSWER

Gentile who hoped to convert all mankind to his particular kind of God or religious creed. The Jew of this day is no more the Jew whom Isaiah chastised than the Church of Rome is the church which Luther castigated so unmercifully. The Jewish people are not laden with iniquity and the church is not a den of thieves. What the Jews were in the days of Isaiah is as of little consequence as is the status of the Christians in the days of St. Augustine. "Yesterday is dead and by it we are neither blessed nor damned." We cannot measure the Jew of 1932 A. D. by the standards of the Jews of 1932 B. C. The present and future relations of Jews towards the rest of mankind must be considered in the light of present day freedom and emancipation. The answer to the Jewish question can be found only if we free our mental vision from words and symbols which tend to arouse our emotions and interfere with rational consideration of facts and circumstances which form the reality of our every day lives.

We should view the Jews of this generation with regard to what they are likely to be in the future, either because or in spite of the past. While the modern Jew may have come from the loins of the Jew of two or five thousand years ago, the Jew of that period could not have conceived of the state of civilization within which we are privileged to live, and it behooves us to look into the future for the purpose of doing our part to make it a better period within which our posterity is bound to live and labor.

When in the past Israel's existence was threatened in any land, he turned to his God and prayed for "*Le shounu-abbu be Yerushulayem*"; when he enjoyed equality and opportunity anywhere, he multiplied and grew

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

mighty, but still continued his proclamation, "in the year to come we shall be in Jerusalem." Since Israel has lost faith in the divine power to bring about the restoration of His people to the Promised Land; the cry in time of despair is, raise money, and the song in time of joy is, raise more money.

Under the pressure of the great war, alleged representatives of the Jewish people succeeded in obtaining from Lord Balfour a scrap of paper which was intended to authorize the colonization of Palestine by Jews, and it was accepted by Jewry as a definite solution of their difficulties. Our people failed to take note of the lack of power in England to grant any group of people the exclusive right to organize a nation in the Holy Land; they closed their eyes to human experience which demonstrates the irresistible opposition of peoples occupying any given territory to outside powers seeking to populate that territory with people from other lands. For the second time in history our people exclaimed, "*Nasseh venishmah*" instead of "*Nishmah Venasseh*."

With the so-called Balfour Declaration in their possession they informed the world that "Zionism is a national movement to secure the freedom of the Jewish people. To create for the Jewish people in Palestine a publicly recognized and legally secured home; and to bring about in Eretz Israel a solution of the Jewish problem. The homeless and landless Jewish people strive to overcome its abnormal political, economic and spiritual conditions by establishing itself in the historic homeland through large and uninterrupted immigration and settlement, and recreating in Eretz Israel its national life with all the essential features of a people's existence." Those who saw a solution of the Jewish question in Zionism com-

THE ANSWER

pletely ignored the fact that all the Jews probably would not consent to leave their native lands and settle in Palestine; and even if there should be established a Jewish nation in Palestine under the English Mandate, there is nothing which can guarantee its permanence or security. It certainly cannot be done by raising money and more money.

But whatever might have been the ultimate result of free and unrestricted migration of Jews into Palestine, if the Arabs remained passive, the disturbing fact is that they refused to sit by and await developments. They became possessed of a suspicion that the promise of the Lord to the Jews was about to be realized: "When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and shall cast out many nations before thee, the Hittite, and the Girgashite, and the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; and when the Lord thy God shall deliver them up before thee, and thou shalt smite them; then thou shalt utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them; neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son."¹ Of course, the uncultured Arabs do not understand that the modern Jew does not take his Bible literally, and that he is a kind and charitable person and would not be so cruel to his fellowman, but he suspects that if the Jews bottom their claim to Palestine on the strength of the historic rights to that land, they can only do so on the authority of the Bible, and the Arab refuses to reject any part of it.

¹*Deut. 7: 1-3.*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

To prevent the consummation directed by the Lord, they, the Arabs, in the summer of 1930, perpetrated a pogrom on the helpless Jews of Palestine which was followed by the promulgation of the new British policy, and the large and uninterrupted immigration into Palestine came to an end. But this is not all. At a Moslem congress, held in Jerusalem in 1931, the non-Jewish population indicated its uncompromising opposition to further Jewish colonization in Palestine by the adoption of a resolution attacking Great Britain as the mandatory responsible for Zionist activity, and addressed a protest to the League of Nations condemning the establishment of the Jewish National Home. Said Bey Sabet, delegate from Iraq, declared: "If the Jews continue their activities in Palestine, we shall be obliged to treat them in the way they know. We will only allow the Jews to stay in their homes and nothing else."

It will not do to cry "Perfidious Albion!" The Balfour Declaration could not have been expected to be of greater force or permanence than was the promise of the Lord. By the covenant between God and Abraham, the Jewish people were told, "This land I give you and all your generations forever." But the possession of the land by God's chosen people covered less than 500 years, and since then Israel's prayers were permitted to go unanswered.

At Basle on July 1, 1931, Dr. Chaim Weitzman, impliedly admitting that a Jewish nation is inconceivable in Palestine, urged that the Arabs must be made to feel, must be convinced by deed as well as by word, that whatever the future numerical relationship of the two nations in Palestine, we, on our part, contemplate no political domination. It is our duty to encourage among our people

THE ANSWER

the study of the Arabic language and literature. "Provided the Mandate is both recognized and respected," continued the Doctor, "we would welcome an agreement between the two kindred races on a basis of political parity." To accept Dr. Weitzman's theory of political parity between the two races, the identity of the kindred racehood must be recognized, and it must be conceded that a nation could be successfully maintained with political parity between two kindred races. But human experience again proves that such national existence cannot endure. Political parity between the south and the north in America was thought possible and it resulted in a war between the "two kindred races" which culminated in the recognition of the principle that a house divided against itself cannot stand. In every land political parity has been tried but never long maintained. No Jewish or Arab National Homeland could be long sustained without either Arabs or Jews exercising political domination. All that could possibly be accomplished is the establishment of a Palestinian Nation dominated by the Palestinian people. If the future of the Jews in Palestine depends upon the mandate being recognized and respected, what will happen if the people of Palestine, like the people of Iraq, should form an independent nation and thus terminate England's mandate over the territory?

Manifestly Palestine cannot be regarded even as an approach towards a solution of the Jewish Question, nor could any rational person perceive in it a temporary or permanent relief from the real or imaginary ills to which our people believe themselves subject.

When England, almost as a noble gesture, granted Israel the privilege to colonize in Palestine, there reverberated throughout the entire world the joyous cry, "The

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Miraculous End hath come." When the Arabs perpetrated a pogrom upon "God's people" in the Holy Land, Jewry gathered in congress at Basle and Paris and passed resolutions of protest, charging England's government with being a Perfidious Albion, and pledged themselves to raise more money. When millions of Arabs, in solemn convention, unqualifiedly declared themselves opposed to further colonization of Jews in Palestine, and England terminated further "large and uninterrupted" migration into that land, Jewry gathered in every country and defiantly declared that its answer is, raise more and more money. When the Hitlerites of Germany served notice upon the native Jews of that nation that they had better get out of the country while the going was good, we met the issue by a hundred-dollar-a-plate dinner for the purpose of raising more money for the reclamation of Eretz Israel.

If a nation cannot be built and maintained on a religious or ethnic foundation; if the Arabs' immediate and ultimate opposition to the Jewifying of Palestine is and will continue; if Palestine finally is not the place where all the Jews ultimately expect to find a permanent home; then sixteen million men and women scattered all over this earth ask, "What now?"

Never in the history of the human race has there ever been a group of people who have enmeshed themselves into so many errors and persisted in refusing to see the truth, as our people have done during the last hundred years. In any other case where people persist in maintaining falsehoods the reason, generally, is ignorance or superstition, but in our case it is neither one nor the other. Our prattle about traditions, culture, background, history, persecution, and discrimination; our claim that we

THE ANSWER

are the children of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; the disciples of Moses, Isaiah, Hillel; the heirs to the Bible and the Torah; that we wept at the stream of Babylon, burnt at the stake in Spain, and vegetated in Europe's ghettos,² will not lead us in the direction of a solution of our problem. No living Jew can trace his descent to a writer of Genesis or Exodus. No rabbi can tell his congregation whether the Bible was written by whites, blacks, or browns; by Semites, Moabites, Canaanites, or Hittites. Our statement, "We wrote the Bible," is as groundless as the declaration by the flock of geese in the well-known fable, "Our ancestors saved Rome," or the claim of the fly on the horn of the ox, "We plowed the field." Some people wrote the Bible; some sacrificed their lives for its preservation; many suffered because they chose to observe its commandments; but the modern Jew had nothing to do with all that.

No living Christian can justly claim credit or distinction on account of having written the New Testament, no living Jew can justly claim to be different from any other human being because some people had written the Bible. No Jew in England is any more competent to fill the office of Viceroy in India because some people of the Jewish faith may have written the Bible, than any Christian is, because some Christians may have written the Magna Charta. The present day Jews have succeeded in ridding themselves of ancient prejudices and tribal and racial pride, they have, as men and women, freed themselves of many of the old fetters which tied our ancestors to Main Street notions of human relations. Steam power, electricity, and the radio have brought humanity so close together that nothing in religion, race, or national con-

¹*Rabbi Solomon Goldman: The Right of the Ethnic Personality.*

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

cept can cause it to become separated. In spite of priests, rabbis and politicians, mankind does, and will continue, in increasing measures, to enjoy in common the benefits and advantages of modern civilization, without regard to ancient dogmas and superstitions and in spite of biblical prohibitions and restrictions.

The problems which now confront humanity are not the Origin of Species, or the Descent of Man; not the Unity or Trinity of God; not the supremacy of this or that church or the authority of priests, rabbis or popes, but the equitable adjustment of the economic and political systems within which we are privileged to live and labor; and the establishment of social arrangements which will contribute towards the happiness of ourselves and our posterity.

No human problem has ever been solved on the basis of theologies, bibles, or utterances of ancient prophets; these were the instruments employed in opposition to every attempt to establish freedom. Thomas Paine's ideas on American Independence were combated by quotations from ancient lore, and in desperation he cried, "I cannot help being sometimes surprised at the complimentary references which I have seen and heard made to ancient histories and transactions. The wisdom, civil government, and sense of honor of the states of Greece and Rome, are frequently held up as objects of excellence and imitation. Mankind have lived to very little purpose, if, at this period of the world, they must go two or three thousand years back for lessons and examples. We do great injustice to ourselves by placing them in such superior line. We have no just authority for it. Neither can we tell why it is that we should suppose ourselves inferior. Could the mist of antiquity be cleared away, and men

THE ANSWER

and things be viewed as they really were, it is more than probable that they would admire us rather than we them. America has surmounted a greater variety and combination of difficulties than, I believe, ever fell to the share of any one people, in the same space of time, and has replenished the world with more useful knowledge and sounder maxims of civil government than were ever produced in any age before." And so with our people, it is no longer necessary to refer to the Bible or the prophets for guidance in civil, political or economic matters; we must start from where we stand rather than from where stood any people two or three thousand years back.

The Jewish Question does not involve, any longer, the right of our people freely to worship according to the dictates of their conscience. Even Old Spain, saturated with the blood of religious martyrs, has separated itself from its national God and established freedom of worship. In its final analysis the question involves nothing more than social relations. The co-mingling of political and economic interests of Jews and Gentiles everywhere will not permit the maintenance of separate groups. The problem that engages the attention of thinking men and women of this day is the removal of irritating conditions that actually or mythically exist between the artificial divisions of mankind.

In the eighteenth century, Moses Mendelssohn conceived the idea that the solution of the Jewish Question depended upon the abolition of the state church. He knew that as long as Germany was legally a Christian nation the Jews in that country could not become Germans. To effectuate the desired result he on one hand advocated the separation of church and state, and on the other hand he proceeded to coax the Jews out of their ghettos and teach them the

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

German language in place of their jargon. He translated the prayer books from Hebrew into German, even as Martin Luther translated Christian prayers from Latin into German. It appeared to him that if the Jews should become nationally Germans and the state should abolish the national church, the Jewish problem would be solved. But what disappointment awaited him! Church and state have been separated by the German nation; the Jews have divorced religion from nationality, but the whole thing resulted in the Jews losing their religion, but retaining their Jewish nationalism!

In spite of all our protests to the contrary, the nationalism of the average Jew is as firmly fixed in his mind as is any superstition in the mind of the most superstitious man. Our people may admit that Jewish nationalism is illogical, but they say it is biological; it may have no land or civil government but it has a consciousness. Our belief that Palestine is the land where our fathers died and the Wailing Wall our pilgrim's pride; our pretended loyalty to King Solomon and King David; our efforts to preserve old, outworn and meaningless traditions, leave us in a state of mind where it becomes impossible for Jew or Gentile to view Jews in any but the national character.

Those who assert that Jews are a religious entity and not a nation should rationally examine the Jewish religion and point out the specific elements which enter into it. Let them compare the religion of a Jew of a hundred years ago with the religion of a Jew of today and note in what particular these are alike. Can anyone discern the difference between the religion of Mr. Justice Brandeis and the religion of the late Chief Justice Taft? In what particular does the religion of Professor Einstein differ from the religion of the late Thomas A. Edison? Is there

THE ANSWER

any real line of demarcation between the religion of Dr. Louis Mann of Chicago and Professor John Dewey? In what way is the religion of Leon Trotzky like the religion of Chaim Weitzman? Take the definition of the Jewish religion by Maimonides and apply it to any modern Jew and it will fit him as badly as the religion of Savonarala will fit the late Georges Clemenceau.

With the quantum of evidence before us required in any case, let us now attempt to arrive at a verdict upon the issues involved. If Judaism is a form of religion, every person observing it necessarily is a Jew and no person who does not observe it can be fairly considered or designated as a Jew. Like any other religious group, Jews within the classification above indicated should be concerned in the preservation and the propagation of their religion and not in the preservation of themselves. An earnest Christian strives to preserve the Christian Faith while a Jew urges his "brethren" forever to preserve themselves as Jews regardless of God and the Torah. If it is still necessary to tag every person with the badge of his religion, then, only such persons as adhere to the Jewish religion should be designated as Jews while those who do not adhere to such religion should not be so designated. If Judaism is a religion and Jews are people who observe, or adhere to that religion, like Christians adhere to theirs, then there is no need for any specific territory within which such religious Jews should dwell with a government of their own.

If Judaism is a religion, and that seems to have been the case for these many thousands of years, and if that religion means the belief in the existence of a God who can reward and punish; in the belief in the divinity of the Torah and its unalterability; in the belief in the com-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

ing of Messiah and in the resurrection of the dead; then the religion of the modern Jew is not Judaism any more than is the religion of a Unitarian Catholicism, if Catholicism means the belief in the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost and the divine authority of the Pope. All so-called Jews who have rejected the element which constituted the Judaism of their fathers should designate themselves as Protestants. They should base their temples upon, say, humanitarianism. Their temples should be devoted entirely to the promulgation of humanitarian principles.

The men and women affiliated with such temples should be known as humanitarians or humanitarian Protestants, e. g., people who not only protest against the divinity of the Pope but against the divinity of the Torah as well. Such a proceeding would tend to separate the person who is a Jew because of his religion from those who are Jews for any other reason, and would enable the world generally to know who is who and why.

If Jews are a nation, even as the Irish or the Poles, then the word Jew should be used as a noun in Judeah or Palestine by persons who are natives of that land, but it should be used as an adjective in every other land where Jews enjoy equality with Christians. In Palestine a native should call himself a Jew, while an immigrant from Russia should be designated as a Russian Jew. A native of Russia who cannot trace his ancestry to Palestine except by way of his religion, should not be designated as a Russian Jew but as a Jewish Russian. A Christian who comes to America from Poland and acquires citizenship is not known as an American Pole but as a Polish American; a Jew who comes from Poland to America and becomes a citizen of the United States should also be desig-

THE ANSWER

nated as a Polish American.

This procedure would soon demonstrate even to the Jew that the Jews are not a nation at all. The mere use of the word Jew as an adjective rather than as a noun would to a great extent demolish every argument now employed by the Hitlers in any land. It may be said that this reversal of terms will not help the situation, but human experience has already proven that it works like magic. For many centuries the Moslem Faith has held all Moslems together even as the Jewish Faith has held the Jews together. A Turk, like a Jew, employed the term which designated his faith as the noun and the term which designated his nationality as the adjective. There were Turkish Mussulmen in Turkey; Arabian Mussulmen in Arabia, and Greek Mussulmen in Greece; just as there are and always have been Turkish Jews in Turkey, Arabian Jews in Arabia and Greek Jews in Greece.

Mr. Hanley H. Hudson, Professor of International Law, of Harvard University, in the American Bar Association Journal of January, 1927, tells how the government at Angora effectively decreed, almost over night, that several million men must take off of their heads a religious symbol which they had worn for centuries, and put in its place the hat which they had cursed for as many centuries. The Turkish revolution, he says, seeks to create a Turkish nation of Turkish people living on Turkish territory; this has involved the conversion of the Turkish Mussulman into a *Moslem Turk*. In the past many of the Turkish people had the sense of belonging to an international community of the Moslem Faith. The Turks finally decided to unify the Turkish population of some seven millions—unity was thought to be possible, however, only by disestablishing the state religion and by

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

throwing off foreign influence of all kinds. The caliph was sent away; the Fez was prohibited and every vestige of international religion was abandoned . . . "The new government wants the Turk to have no characteristics which would set him apart from Western people . . . The new Turkey is a homogeneous, secular, nationalist state, and its face is turned towards the West."

Fanatical Mussulmen in and out of Turkey regard this action of the Turkish government as tyrannical, and Jews, who prefer to cling to their shtreimel and payeths, fear that sooner or later this westernizing of the Turkish people will in some way interfere with their ancient customs and traditions; but it must be admitted that the course chosen by Turkey is the only one which can make of the Turkish people a homogeneous, secular modern nation. From the moment that Turkey disestablished the state religion, the Jews in that land secured the opportunity to become Turks. And yet by using Judaism as a noun, the Jews are doomed to remain Turkish Jews rather than Jewish Turks. A Moslem Turk, of course, is a person who adheres to the Moslem faith which is a definite and specific form of religion with a God, a Church, and a certain form of prayer. A Jew could not come within the same definition because there is no evidence that would tend in the slightest degree to prove that the every-day Jew in Turkey is an adherent to any specific form of religion or that all Jews, like all Mussulmen, are of the same faith. If the Jews, too, have disestablished the state religion and have thrown off the influence of the dead past as well as every vestige of international religion, what will preserve us as Jewish Americans or Jewish Turks?

On the 11th of October, 1932, Premier Julius Goem-

THE ANSWER

boes of Hungary told his parliament that he had revised his opinion of the Jews. He realized that they showed the same heroism and patriotism during the war and after as other Hungarians. "Those Jews who are willing to share the fate and responsibilities of Hungary I welcome as Magyar brothers." Here is an approach towards unity and peace. Will the Jews answer with the declaration that in Hungary is "precisely where they expect to remain Jews and preserve their national character" or will they say: "Very well. Henceforth, we are Magyars ready to share the fate and responsibilities of Hungary. Henceforth, we shall not be known as Hungarian Jews but only as Hungarians reserving to every individual, the right to worship God in any manner he sees fit?" It might be said that the demand of such a declaration is a demand for unconditional surrender, but a nation like any community has the unqualified right to demand wholehearted surrender on the part of every individual to the whole. Recently a Jew was required to leave a reform temple in Chicago because he would not wear a skull cap. If a congregation has a right to require such surrender to its rules, a nation certainly has the right to insist that every individual within it should be wholly part of it.

· The average Jew becomes alarmed at any suggestion which might lead to Jews becoming Germans or Americans. It may have been Jacob Gordon who told the story about a little Jewish boy who stood crying while holding one end of a string between his teeth, with the other end tied to a hitching post. "What are you crying about?" asked a passerby. "Abie and I," answered the little fellow, "were playing horse, and he tied me to the post and went into the house to get some bread and butter and hasn't come back." "Why don't you let go of the

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

string and go into the house yourself?" "Then," said the boy tearfully, "I would not be a horse."

The modern Jew, smarting under numerous infinitesimal disadvantages resulting from his being a Jew, thinks that he can conceal his Jewishness by abandoning his religion, which results in the clinging, by most of the Jews, to the ancient idea of Jewish nationality; and this in turn continues to nurture the old anti-Semitism based on the charge that the Jew is not part of any nation but is a part of an international group designated as this or that kind of Jews. Some Jews, when realizing the logical consequences that follow the idea of being nationally Jewish, deny that the Jews consider themselves a nation but the complex is so firmly fixed that even the Gentiles have always spoken of us rather as a nation than a religious group. Mr. James Truslow Adams, speaking of the formation of the American nation, says that it had been influenced largely by the steady infusion in large numbers of Germans, Irish, Swedes, Russians, Jews and others. The author of the *Epic of America* would be surprised at the result obtained by a rewording of his statement, and saying that the American nation has been influenced by the steady infusion of men and women from Germany, Italy, Ireland and Sweden. This form of expressing the same thought, would of course include Jews from these countries who came here with Catholics, Lutherans and Presbyterians. He did not, therefore, use the term Jews in a religious but national sense. Where, then, did the Jews like the others come from as nationals?

The Jews in the United States, while in fact Americans, still insist that they are a national minority and as such, participate in every function involving minority nationals. Whenever the Poles, the Germans, the Bohe-

THE ANSWER

mians or the Italians undertake to stage a minority national demonstration of one sort or another, the Jews officially at once stage their own. When "Men without country" meet anywhere, the Jews are conspicuously present. Mr. John Gunther in a copyrighted dispatch to the *Chicago Daily News*, June 30th, 1932, reports the opening of a parliament in Vienna attended by delegates representing 40,000,000 Europeans of the Edward Everett Hale type. There were Basques from Spain, Slovenes and Croats from Jugoslavia, Ukrainians from Poland and Jews from Esthonia, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Roumania. These Jews coming from their native lands and joining the other "men without country" serve notice upon the world that they are not Esthonians, Latvians, Poles, Czechoslovakians or Roumanians. What difference does it make if Jews declare that they are German or other citizens of the Jewish faith, if in their endeavors they act as nationally Jewish, supported and reinforced by the emphatic declarations of leading Jews? Professor Einstein asserts Jewish Nationhood, Rabbi Solomon Goldman declares that the Jews are a nation, Ludwig Lewisohn maintains that the Jew cannot change his national character and cannot be improved into being a Pole.

As these pages are being written a hundred and fifty million people in Russia of all faiths are engaged on a job that challenges the whole of human experience. As a result of their joint effort there will probably come forth a nation of men and women without either Christian or Jewish religion, equal before the law, and enjoying the blessing of economic and political equality. Will the descendants of Jews even then continue to claim distinction on account of Jewish nationality? What are the

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

relative values of our hopes and ambitions for a Jewish Homeland compared with the hopes and ambitions of mankind? Should we retard the advent of an era of world community by emphasizing creed against creed or race against race, or should we hasten that day?

For the purpose of arriving at a solution of the Jewish Question, let us also begin by abandoning the plural personal pronoun and adopt the singular form. Like every other man, each Jew should speak for himself. If one desires to maintain the position that he belongs to the Jewish or Nordic race, that is his business, but he should not make the racial term all inclusive. Dr. Weitzman may consider himself a member of the Jewish race, but he should not speak of all Jews as belonging to that race, including a redheaded Jew in England, a blond Jew in Sweden, a blue-eyed Jew in Ireland and a black-faced Jew in Africa. The use of the personal pronoun "We" enables every Jew to place himself in some niche in the "Hall of Fame" without individual achievement of any sort. No Jew could say, "I wrote the Bible; I wept at the Stream of Babylon; I burnt at the stake in Spain or I and God grew up together." When Charles Lindbergh said "we flew from New York to Paris" he did not mean the Swedes or Norwegians or the Vikings of two thousand years ago, but he limited himself entirely to Lindbergh and his ship. When a Jew says "We" he excludes himself as an actor in the part he is talking about, but includes men who have been dead a long time and were not Jews at all. When in "We" is included Job, he was a Chaldean and not a Jew; when Maimonides is included, he was an Egyptian; when Disraeli is embraced in "We," he was an Englishman. If the Jews should begin to use the singular pronoun instead of the plural, they would

THE ANSWER

soon find that the average Jew has nothing in particular to talk about as being Jewish; he could then say, "I am a Frenchman" instead of "We are Jews," or "I am an American" instead of "We American Jews." The true nationality of the individual would then come to the surface instead of being obscured in the all embracing "We Jews."

The answer to the Jewish Question is not race or ancient tradition, but nationalism. Not nationalism based on theology, culture, language or blood, but nationalism based on geographical boundaries and civil government. Mr. Lewisohn inadvertently indicates the fundamental cause of Jewish embarrassment when, speaking of four million Jews in Poland, he says: "The Jews have shared their (the Poles') air and earth and bread for nine hundred years; their ancient wooden synagogues are the oldest architectural monuments on Polish ground . . . The Polish state . . . has a clear memory. It knows that the four million Jews within its boundaries cannot be improved into being Poles, but demand the right . . . of being themselves."³ The Jewish Question can be answered by repudiating the charge that the Jews in Poland cannot be improved into being Poles, and by declaring that every Jew born and living in Poland is in truth and in fact as much a Pole as any Christian is.

The nationality of a Jew in Oshkosh must avowedly be based, not on Joseph, Moses or Abraham, but on the colonists' courage to declare themselves free and independent, not on the poetry of Solomon, but on the wisdom of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Lincoln; not on the scrolls, but on the Declaration of Independence; not on the story of Samson slaying thousands with the

³*Israel*: 97.

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

jawbone of an ass, but upon the sacrifices at Bunker Hill and Valley Forge; not on the presence or absence of Jewish sailors on the Santa Maria, but on the valiant fight of the men on Old Ironsides. Mr. Max Steuer, one of the great lawyers in New York, speaking of Judaism, says, "I am an American citizen of the Jewish faith just as my neighbor is an American citizen of the Catholic or Protestant denomination. But being an American citizen and dreaming of a Jewish Homeland at the same time is a flagrant contradiction . . . a divided patriotism is unthinkable. It is either the flag of a Jewish Homeland or the American flag; the latter is my choice, my duty, my love." What Jew in America will challenge the soundness of this doctrine outside of those involved in the Zionist fog? If the Jew in Germany and in Poland could understand and follow this doctrine the Hitlers would be left without any occupations. It is high time for Jews in Poland to challenge the charge that they cannot be improved into being Poles although they have for nine hundred years shared the air and bread and land with the Polish people. All the Jew in Poland has to do is divorce his religion from his nationality and he will find himself a Pole, proud of every achievement of the Polish nation. He ought to be able to say with the rest of the Poles, *Yestche Polsha Nezginella Poki Mi Zshiemy*. This is not violent self-destruction, but the assertion of one's right to participate in the hopes and ambitions of his people. The concluding paragraph of Mr. Steuer is applicable to all Jews everywhere; "I would combat prejudice with logical persuasion through friendly association . . . We must be careful not to give the impression that we are an individual people within a people. Really we are not that. We are an integral part of the great

THE ANSWER

melting pot of countries and nations. Our efforts should be to help obliterate distinctions and demarcations in the life of the world."

The nationality of a Jew in Germany is not founded upon the fact that Heinrich Heine was a Jew, but upon the struggle of the German people to preserve themselves as a great nation. Within the veins of every Jew in Germany courses the blood intermingled with the blood of every man who ever labored in, and fought for, his Fatherland. Avowedly, every Jew in Germany should base his nationality on Bismarck, Von Moltke, Goethe, the Kaiser, and Von Hindenburg, all wrapped up in the proposition, *Deutschland Ueber Alles*. This is not Germanizing Jews or converting Jews to Christianity, but the assertion of the truth. Every German of any faith is permeated with this thought and one of the Jewish faith need not shirk his responsibility. The war lords of Germany were not all good Christians, and Jews were as responsible for the recent world catastrophe as were Lutherans.

On our journey forward, we acquired a different character from that possessed by those who a hundred years ago were classified as Jews. The modern Jew compared with the Jew of old is as different as is the automobile from the ox-cart, but we failed to acquire a term that would properly distinguish us of today. As long as Judaism involved purely theological problems, rabbis could dispute with rabbis about the meaning of this or that line or word in the Torah. Theological students spent their lives in the effort to understand the word of God, and the common people made tremendous sacrifices to live up to the conclusions arrived at by these scholars. The situation, however, has changed; we are not con-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

cerned much about the prohibitions, statutes and ordinances in the Torah, our discussions of problems that affect Jewry are concerned with actualities rather than with metaphysics.

The desire of the anti-Semites to exclude the Jews from their countries may be a lesson we have taught the Christians. If it is proper for us to strive to make Palestine as Jewish as England is English it should be considered perfectly proper for the Germans to want to make Germany as German as the Jews want to make Palestine Jewish. If it is a fact that a Jew is a different human being from any other; if his world outlook is different; if different blood courses through his veins, then it is eminently proper for non-Jews in any community to protest against Jews living among them or filling responsible positions in public or private life. On the other hand, if the Jew is a human being equal to all others then let us quit jabbering about our desire to "rebuild the world into being Jewish and destroying it for the non-Jews."

In recent years Mussolini issued an edict declaring that once an Italian always an Italian, and that no matter where an Italian may have had his being he must ever defend Italy. In response to this edict, the Italian people of America undertook the promotion of organizations in our great cities, dedicated to this so-called Italian idea of *Patria Mio*. At once a powerful committee of leading Americans was formed in New York, with Rabbi Stephen S. Wise as one of its members, with the object of inducing Congress to adopt proper legislation which would thwart Il Duce in his effort to Italianize Americans of Italian descent. The whole matter having assumed such serious proportions as to provoke discussion in the Amer-

THE ANSWER

ican press, the Italians of America recognized the impropriety of their undertaking, and without much ado, dissolved their entire organization. This action on their part was not deemed cowardly or suicidal, but an expression of loyalty to the country of their adoption. If we test the national concept of the Jewish people by the same rule by which Rabbi Stephen S. Wise tested the decree of Mussolini, we are driven to the conclusion that any claim to Jewish nationality is subversive of national unity in any land.

During the World War Germans in the United States changed their names from Schmidt to Smith and from Dinkelspiel to Jackson in order to eliminate hyphenated Americanism. This was not considered a betrayal of the German nation or assimilation, but an evidence of loyalty to America in time of stress. Our people have been changing Yankelowich to Marshal and Levi to Hamilton in an effort to conceal their ancestry, but they seem to think that even with these new names they still are part of the Jewish nation.

The thing that stands between our freedom and social slavery is the Jewish national complex. Remove the adjective *Jewish* and we have nationalism in its full and complete significance. It may be suggested that such simple nationalism is Babbitlike, and the answer is: If it is narrow for a person to be nationally American, it certainly is much narrower for a person to be nationally Jewish. In the first instance one at least bases his nationalism on country, government and culture, while in the second he bases his nationalism on a theology which he definitely refuses to recognize.

At the threshold of our investigation is the ascertainment of causes rather than symptoms. Those who under-

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

take to argue our case, therefore, must abandon the use of meaningless words and outworn phrases. In an article entitled, "Shall Jacob Perish?" published in the *Reflex* of July, 1929, Rabbi Solomon Goldman says, "The Jew, full of the vigor of life with the strength of Hercules in his loins, has often paused to question the value and purport of his existence. 'Is the assimilation of the Jew desirable?' he has asked himself. This question has been considered pro and con to date by innumerable publicists. Can one point to such a mark of detachment on the part of any other racial, historical or cultural group? Try to reword the subject substituting the name of another group for the Jewish. 'Is the assimilation of the French desirable?' 'Is the assimilation of the Belgians desirable?' The mere juxtaposition of the words seem to produce an unnatural ring. 'The minority, to live, must think, must be on the alert. It dare not bury its head in the sand if it hopes to enjoy the least modicum of comfort and freedom. It must examine and evaluate traditions and cultures not of its own making. It cannot remain narrow and provincial. It must transcend the limits of its own group and cast its vision far and wide'."

' To this may be added the statement of Mr. Maurice Samuel, in his "*You Gentiles*," that the only solution of the Jewish problem lies in the "free and unrestricted intermarriage." But he thinks that that "will result in the proportionate Judaization of the Gentile world and that a world that has absorbed the Jews will, to that extent, be a Jewish world tinged with Jewish blood."

Blood does not create religious beliefs and God has not infused any particular kind of blood into the veins of the Jewish people. The intermarriage between a Silverman and a Goldstein will not necessarily produce a

THE ANSWER

Beaconsfield. Mr. Samuel thinks that intermarriage will produce a half-Jew in the first generation and quarter Jew in the second. One would imagine that Jews are in the same category with Negroes whose marriages to whites produces mulattos, etc. If the Jew must examine and evaluate traditions and cultures and cannot remain narrow and provincial then it behooves him to inquire into the reason why the same phrase used towards any other people has an unnatural ring. The old Talmudists would never have permitted such ambiguity to remain in the Torah without a full and complete analysis. The reason the expression "shall the French assimilate" has an unnatural ring is because the French are neither a racial, historical, or cultural group. The French are a nation and for that reason the assimilation of the French can not come into question. An examination of the terms *assimilation* and *intermarriage* will disclose that our use of them is contrary to reason and fact. There is absolutely no way in which we could use the expression French or Belgian assimilation. The marriage between a French young man and a Belgian young woman is not assimilation or intermarriage *per se*; and this is so, even though the man should happen to be a Presbyterian and the woman a Swedenborgian. The fact is not altered if the man should happen to be a Nordic and the woman a Teuton. But if the man happens to be a Jew and the woman a Baptist then, even though both are French, we call it assimilation or intermarriage. The anomalous result is due to our interchangeable use of the terms religion, race and nation. If the term *Jew* means a person of a certain religious belief, then, of course, it is inconceivable how such a person could be born half Jew, because his father was a Jew and his mother a Christian.

FROM PHARAOH TO HITLER

Intermarriage between people of different religious faiths can never produce a half Jew and a half Christian. If on the other hand the term *Jew* is used to designate a certain race, then of course it is as natural to speak of assimilation between Negroes and whites as it is between Jews and Negroes. Not being "narrow and provincial . . . transcending the limits of our own group" we much come to the conclusion that the unnatural ring in the juxtaposition of the words lies in our own use of a phrase which clashes with human thought. If the Jew in France is a Frenchman, then the marriage between him and a French woman is not assimilation at all even though they differ in their religious faiths.

If the rabbi has in mind the question whether it is proper for a Jew to assimilate his religious belief with others, his use of the word French or Belgian is most inappropriate and proves that the Jew has not yet "transcended the limits of his own group" and is still "provincial and narrow," for, he, in spite of logic to the contrary, persists in classifying himself as a member of a nation which has its foundation on a theological error.

The rabbi quotes with approval, the language of a "brilliant anthropologist" to the effect that the Jew is an internationalist and adds that "he cannot be submerged into some nationalistic group or barter his nationalism or even tribalism or religious denominationalism." In this last lies the *causus belli*. The Jew is not an internationalist, but is as national as any other citizen of the same country. Judge Brandeis will certainly reverse the judgment of Rabbi Goldman and hold that he is as much an American nationally as is his colleague, Judge Holmes, and the erstwhile Lord Chief Justice of England will take serious exception at being designated an interna-



Copyright, Harris & Ewing

THE ANSWER

tionalist. In one breath our people claim to be internationalists and in the next breath they assert that Jewish nationhood is an ineluctable fact. For the purpose of acquiring the "least modicum of comfort and freedom" we should learn to fish or cut bait.

The late Mr. George A. Dorsey, raised the curtain on his "*Man's Own Show*" with the observation that he had just heard over the radio the statement that we have developed a great civilization, and he pricked up his ears, hoping to learn who "we" are, how civilization is "developed," what makes it "great" and what is "civilization?" "Speech," says Mr. Dorsey, "is the most important, the most human, the most humanizing and incomparably the most socializing tool or instrument devised by man, and 'civilization wabbles because there are too many hollow, unsocial, word-made ideas in its foundation, too many false words in its vocabulary.'"

Once the Jew obtains a clear understanding of the terms *nation*, *religion* and *race*; once he learns to know what makes a nation Jewish, how the Jewishness of a race can be determined, and what elements in religion make it Jewish; once he learns intelligently to tell the world what he means by Jewish background, Jewish culture, Jewish traditions and Jewish life; then will he realize that there is very little left of Jewishness for which he is ready to suffer and die, and which he proposes to bequeath to posterity as a contribution towards its greater security, comfort, and happiness.

INDEX

- ADAMS, James Truslow**
On Charity 27
Jews as a Nation..... 202
- BAUER, Otto**
Jews as a Nation..... 138
- BIBLE, The**
Obligation to keep the Statutes 52
Covenant with Abraham 54
Provision against Interest.... 55
Sabbath 55
Thou Shalt Not Seeth the Kid in Its Mother's Milk... 56
Earlocks 56
Against Swine 57
- B'NAI B'rith**
World Union of Jewish Youth 32
Jews as a Cultural Group.... 68
Jews as Candidates for Public Offices 107
Polish Lawyers ... 37
- BREMER, Karl B.**
Jews as Aliens..... 153
- BROWNE, Louis**
Why are Jews Like That?.. 79
- COHEN, Morris Raphael**
Judaism sans God..... 71
- COHON, Samuel S.**
God in Judaism 68
Strife among Jews 107
Jealousy among Jews 170
- DEWEY, John**
The Business of Thought.... 8
Responsibility to Think Well. 40
Germany Proud of Itself.... 91
Imposition of Will..... 97
Inoperative Creeds 130
- DORSEY, George H.**
Racial Attributes 91
- DUBNOW**
Jews as Minorities 30
- EICHART Hans Van**
Checked Jewish Progress.... 58
- EINSTEIN, Prof.**
There is no God Who Rewards 67
- Equality in America* 101
Palestinian University 34
- EMERSON, Ralph Waldo**
Influence of Environment.... 78
Racial Characteristics 97
- ENELOW, H. S., Rabbi**
Jesus, the Best in Israel..... 6
- EXCOMMUNICATION**
Power of 59
Of Spinoza 133
- FERGUSON, James**
Palestinian Grandeur 122
- FISCHBERG, Maurice, Dr.**
Are the Jews a Race?..... 99
- FISHER, Mitchell Salem**
Judaism is not What It Seems to Be 66
- FREEMAN, Edward Augustus**
Origin of Society 76
- GAMARON, Emanuel**
Jewish Education 39
- GANDHI, Mahatma**
Sacredness of the Cow..... 175
- GOEMBOES, Julius**
Jews as Magyars..... 200
- GOLDEN, Herbert S.**
Jews as a Religious Group.... 33
- GOLDMAN, Solomon**
What is a Jew?..... 3
Nationalism 20
Jewish Nationhood 134
Our Ancestors 193
Shall Jacob Perish?..... 210
- GRAETZ**
Mixtures of Arabs and Jews. 76
Origin of Jews in Germany.. 83
Origin of Jews in Spain..... 84
Jewish Pride 85
- GROSSMAN, Jacob, Mrs.**
Jews as a Religious Group.. 32
- HADASSAH Women**
Answer to the White Paper.. 18
- HAMAN**
On Extermination of Jews... 4

INDEX

- The Story of Purim*..... 120
- HARRIS, Maurice H.
The Chasars 82
- HEINE, Heinrich
Jews and the Bible 57
- HERZL, Theodor
On Charity 36
Jewish Nationalism 48
Enmity towards Jews 139
- HIRSCH, Emil
Mythology of the Bible..... 40
- HOLMES, Jesse H.
Foundation of Churches 66
- HUDSON, Hanley H.
Law Reform in Turkey... . 199
- HUME, David
Define Your Terms..... . 48
- INGERSOLL, Robert G.
Theocracy in Government.... 142
- ISAIAH
Protest against Festivals.... 120
- JACOBSON, Moses P.
Opposition to Jewish Nationalism 143
- JEWISH Layman
Going to Synagogue..... 69
- JEWISH Youth, World Union of
Judaism sans Faith..... 32
- JOCHAI, Simon Ben
Spiritual vs. Material Things 58
- JOSEPH, Charles H.
What is a Jew?..... 3
- JUNG, Carl G.
Indian Blood in the American People 81
- KALLEN, Horace M.
Palestine, a Slum.... . 112
- KEITH, Sir Arthur
Roman Noses 84
- KOHLER, Dr.
Nobility of Jesus 6
Jewish Creed 28
- LANCIANI, Rudolfo Amedeo
Fallibility of History..... 127
- LAZARE, Bernard
Jewish Privileges 183
- LEIKEN, George
The Polishing of the Jew.... 24
- LEVI, Gerson B.
Children Will Not Follow the Fathers 35
Fleeing from Religion 62
Against Ethnic Nationalism . 163
- LEVINE, Raphael H.
On Jewish History 40
- LEWISOHN, Ludwig
Religion and God..... 42
Jewish Art 44
Jewish Nationhood in America 159
Against Assimilation 160
On Preservation of Tradition. 175
Jews in Poland 205
- LIPPMAN, Walter
People's Loss of Interest in Churches 66
- LISSAUER, Rabbi Herman
Humanism and Jews..... 117
- LUTHER, Martin
Degeneration of the Church . 185
- LYMAN, Alexander
Jewish Nationalism 23
- MAIMONIDES
What is Jewish Religion? ... 51
Destruction of His Books.... 60
- MANN, Louis
Judaism not a Theology 34
- MATHEWS, Dr. Shailer
What is Christianity?..... 65
- MELAMED, S. M.
For Jewish University..... 33
Arabs as a Race..... 75
- MENDELSSOHN, Frantz O.
Elected to International Chamber of Commerce..... 109
- MENTOR, The
Discrimination against Jews.. 121
- MICHAEL Reese Hospital
Exclusion of Russian Jews from 130
- MOREHOUSE, Ward
Palestine 122
- MORRISON, Samuel Eliot
Puritan Complex 70
- MOSS, Louis J.
On Ancient Practices 113

INDEX

MUNDELEIN, Cardinal		SEGAL, Alfred	
<i>Absence of Religion in American Homes</i>	24	<i>The Trials of the Rabbi</i>	114
MUSSOLINI		SILVER, Abba Hillel	
<i>Patria, Mio</i>	208	<i>Jewish Palestine</i>	17
NACHMANI, Moses Ben		<i>American Nation</i>	47-133
<i>Divinity of the Torah</i>	57	SPANISH Constitution	157
PAINE, Thomas		SPRINGER, Arthur	
<i>It is Cruel to Amuse</i>	111	<i>Definition of Nationality</i>	138
<i>We and the Ancients</i>	194	STELZLE, Rev. Charles	
RADIN, Max		<i>People do not Believe in Church</i>	65
<i>Jews, a Religious Group</i> . . .	45	STEUER, Max	
<i>Jews are not Semites</i>	87	<i>I am an American</i>	206
<i>Influence of Country on Its People</i>	163	SPINOZA, Baruch	
RAISIN, Jacob S.		<i>Excommunication of</i>	123
<i>Conversion of Russians</i> . . .	83	TCHERNOVITZ, Chaim	
RELIGION		<i>Jewish Claim to Palestine</i>	144
<i>Webster's Definition</i>	51	VOLTAIRE	
<i>Maimonides</i>	51	<i>Moses and the Jews</i>	149
RENAN, Ernest		<i>Forget the Past</i>	185
<i>Jews are not a Race</i>	86	WEITZMAN, Chaim	
RODKINSON, Michael L.		<i>Joint Operation with Arabs</i> ..	191
<i>Excommunication</i>	60	WELLS, H. G.	
ROSENFELD, Henry		<i>Jews are not a Race</i>	85
<i>Jewish Press</i>	128	WILMAN, Henry H.	
RUSSELL, Charles Edward		<i>Judaism after the Fall</i>	58
<i>Jews in Politics</i>	44	WINSLOW, Thyra Samter	
SAMUEL, Maurice		<i>Jewish Employees</i>	106
<i>Jews as Destroyers</i>	127	WISE, Stephen S.	
<i>National Gods</i>	140	<i>Jewish Race</i>	79
<i>Jews as Aliens</i>	152	<i>Jewish Lack of Unity</i>	96
<i>Jews and God</i>	168	<i>Jews Must be Jews</i>	104
<i>Judaizing Gentiles</i>	210	ZIONISM	
SCHAUNFARBER, Tobias		<i>Definition of</i>	188
<i>Unbelieving Rabbis</i>	115	<i>Ye Shall Destroy All the Nations Before You</i>	189
SCHNITZER, Arthur		<i>Arabic, Opposition to</i>	190
<i>On Chauvinism</i>	16	<i>Ultimate Purpose</i>	190
		<i>Steuer and Zionism</i>	206

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



133 223

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

